



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Operationalizing an ecosystem services-based approach using Bayesian Belief Networks: An application to riparian buffer strips*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/88324/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

McVittie, A, Norton, L, Martin-Ortega, J et al. (3 more authors) (2015) Operationalizing an ecosystem services-based approach using Bayesian Belief Networks: An application to riparian buffer strips. *Ecological Economics*, 110. 15 - 27. ISSN 0921-8009

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.12.004>

(c) 2014, Elsevier. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Operationalizing an ecosystem services-based approach using Bayesian Belief**
2 **Networks: an application to riparian buffer strips**

3
4 **Abstract**

5 The interface between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems contributes to the provision of key ecosystem
6 services including improved water quality and reduced flood risk. We develop an ecological-economic
7 model using a Bayesian Belief Network (BBN) to assess and value the delivery of ecosystem services from
8 riparian buffer strips. By capturing the interactions underlying ecosystem processes and the delivery of
9 services we aim to further the operationalization of ecosystem services approaches. The model is
10 developed through outlining the underlying ecological processes which deliver ecosystem services.
11 Alternative management options and regional locations are used for sensitivity analysis.

12 We identify optimal management options but reveal relatively small differences between impacts of
13 different management options. We discuss key issues raised as a result of the probabilistic nature of the
14 BBN model. Uncertainty over outcomes has implications for the approach to valuation particularly where
15 preferences might exhibit non-linearities or thresholds. The interaction between probabilistic outcomes
16 and the statistical nature of valuation estimates suggests the need for further exploration of sensitivity in
17 such models. Although the BBN is a promising participatory decision support tool, there remains a need to
18 understand the trade-off between realism, precision and the benefits of developing joint understanding of
19 the decision context.

20 **Keywords:** Bayesian Networks; Ecosystem services; Interdisciplinary research; Valuation

21

22 **1 Introduction**

23 Recent years have seen the growing adoption of ecosystem services-based approaches for analysis and
24 decision-making with respect to the environment. This approach has also encouraged the development of a
25 common language across natural and social science disciplines that in turn has led to joint analysis and
26 assessments. Notable examples of the latter include the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, 2005) and
27 the UK's National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA, 2011). However, the increasing prevalence of
28 interdisciplinary analysis has highlighted the need to further develop common models and tools to explore
29 our joint understanding of ecosystem services that might better inform management and policy (Martin-
30 Ortega et al., 2015). This is the key issue in the operationalization of ecosystem services as an analytical and
31 decision making approach. To this end there have been some targeted attempts to foster interdisciplinary
32 working, such as the UK's Valuing Nature Network¹, which specifically seeks to promote research capacity
33 on the integration of approaches to the valuation of ecosystem services to support policy and practice.

34 The complexities and interdependencies among components within and between ecosystems make
35 describing and quantifying interactions within and across ecosystems a considerable challenge (Heal et al.,
36 2001; Pereira et al. 2005; Carpenter et al., 2009; Maskell et al., 2013). Multiple ecological mechanisms
37 interact within ecosystems resulting in the delivery of single or multiple services; or a single mechanism
38 may contribute to multiple ecosystem services. The provision of ecosystem services may also be dependent
39 on the contributions of many different ecosystems (Defra, 2007), for example good water quality arises
40 from both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. Hence, policy decisions affecting any part of those
41 interactions can cause changes across multiple services and ecosystems. Given this complexity, from an
42 economic perspective the value of any ecosystem service may then be determined by its relationship with
43 other services (UK NEA, 2011).

44 NRC (2005) reviewed studies attempting to integrate ecological and economic knowledge to value either
45 single or multiple ecosystem services, concluding that our inability to estimate the 'true' value of ecosystem

¹ The VNN is a UK Natural Environment Research Council funded initiative aimed at bringing together natural and social scientists, economists, policy-makers and business interests. <http://www.valuing-nature.net/>

46 services is mainly associated with three factors: i) lack of ecological understanding of how ecosystem
47 services are being affected by alternative management practices, ii) inadequacy of the existing economic
48 techniques to quantify the 'true' value of multiple ecosystem services, and iii) inability to integrate
49 ecological and economic knowledge. In order to tackle the methodological challenges of valuing ecosystem
50 services, there is a growing consensus that integrated studies should be undertaken, which account for the
51 interactions and non-linear relationships among ecosystem components (Carpenter et al., 2009; Kremen
52 and Ostfeld, 2005; Tallis and Kareiva, 2005; Turner et al., 2003). Many authors suggest that it is necessary
53 to develop a more holistic (Turner and Daily, 2008), interdisciplinary valuation approach that integrates
54 economic and ecological knowledge (Brauman et al., 2007; Hein et al., 2006; O'Riordan et al., 2002; Pagiola
55 et al., 2004). In other words, there is need for an approach that could quantify the economic value of the
56 'ecosystem service cascade' proposed by Haines-Young and Potschin (2009), integrating the underlying
57 linkages between services and processes to provide a more accurate estimate of the ecosystem value.

58 A common problem with developing interdisciplinary models and tools has been to integrate different
59 scientific and social science disciplines that operate at varying degrees of complexity. Biophysical science
60 approaches to ecosystems operate over a wide range of scales and complexities including very context
61 specific field studies (Norton et al., 2012a). Socio-economic approaches, such as non-market valuation, are
62 often broad-brushed to avoid overburdening survey respondents, whose values we seek, with complex
63 information. Relevant economic data are also often only available at large scales (e.g. national or regional).
64 Neither of these scales may match policy or decision-making. Consequently, there is a potential mismatch
65 of complexity and scales in the use of extant models and data. In order to operationalize an ecosystem
66 services-based approach researchers and decision makers may need to develop joint models where we
67 explicitly *sacrifice* precision in disciplinary approaches to achieve outcomes that are still of use to decision
68 making.

69 In this paper we present an interdisciplinary approach based on Bayesian Belief Networks (BBN) in the hope
70 of provoking discussion and debate about the virtues and limitations of BBNs as a tool to address some of
71 the integration challenges. The benefit of using BBNs in natural resource management is their usefulness

72 for predicting the links between management practices and ecosystem reactions (Clark et al., 2001; Borsuk
73 et al., 2004), while they can also deal with a large number of interconnected data and integrate different
74 types of variables (e.g. environmental, economic, social and physical variables) or knowledge from diverse
75 sources (Bromley et al., 2005). In fact, BBNs have been widely applied in environmental studies including
76 fisheries assessment (Kuikka et al., 1999; Lee and Rieman, 1997; Pollino et al., 2007); forest restoration
77 (Haas et al., 1994); climate change problems (Gu et al., 1996; Kuikka and Varis, 1997); habitat restoration
78 (Rieman et al., 2001); watershed management (Hamilton et al. 2007; Ames et al., 2005; Borsuk et al., 2004;
79 Bromley et al., 2005; Henriksen et al., 2004) and nitrogen pollution impacts on wetland ecosystem services
80 (Spence and Jordan, 2013). The review by Landuyt et al. (2013) indicates the excellent conceptual fit
81 between the structure of BBN's and the ecosystem service production cascade (Haines-Young and Potschin
82 (2009), but alludes to limited attempts in the literature to exploit the potential of BBN's for elucidating the
83 cascade in particular cases of ecosystem services delivery. Haines-Young (2011) uses two case studies from
84 the UK NEA to explore how BBNs could be used to operationalize different components of the cascade
85 model. This paper seeks to develop this approach by explicitly analysing the effects of one management
86 mechanism (riparian buffer strips) on the delivery of ecosystem services (in the UK NEA example used by
87 Haines-Young, different land cover scenarios are explored but not linked to management mechanisms).
88 Landuyt et al. (2013) note, that BBNs have particular value because of the capacity for using them to
89 consider the delivery of multiple ecosystem services whilst allowing the integration of multidisciplinary
90 knowledge. However, they conclude that the integration of decision nodes and valuation into Bayesian
91 networks remains an important challenge; this paper attempts to address that challenge.

92 The BBN was developed through a series of workshops under the Valuing Nature Network involving natural
93 and economic scientists interested in identifying approaches for valuing the provision of ecosystem services
94 across agricultural and aquatic ecosystems. The choice to focus on water quality and flood risk was based
95 on workshop discussions around these two high profile services which are a focus of policy with respect to
96 the European Water Framework Directive and Floods Directive. Buffer strips were identified as a relevant
97 management instrument, widely employed through various agri-environment schemes for precisely the
98 delivery of those services (Doody et al., 2012; Haygarth et al., 2009), and used here as a test case. We

99 recognise that buffer strips offer a far wider range of services (Stutter et al., 2012) but in recognition of the
100 potential complexity of valuing all these services, we have focused on the water services only. In the
101 following section we discuss the issue of complexity and interactions in ecosystem service analysis and
102 subsequent economic valuation in the context of the approach adopted. We then outline our approach
103 before describing its specific application to riparian buffer strips. Finally we discuss outputs from this model
104 and its further potential development.

105 **2 Ecosystem service valuation – complexity, interactions and scale**

106 As Boyd and Banzhaf (2007) argue, there should be a clear distinction between the ‘final ecosystem
107 services’ that are directly consumed by individuals and the ‘intermediate ecosystem functions’ or processes
108 that contribute to their delivery. Ecological processes are considered the intermediate biological, physical
109 and chemical interactions between ecosystem services, rather than end-products. For instance, nutrient
110 cycling and water flow are ecological functions which interact to deliver the service of water quality
111 alongside other ecosystem services. Haines-Young and Potschin (2009) use the idea of a ‘service cascade’ to
112 illustrate the mechanisms that underpin the connections between ecological assets and welfare, and the
113 series of intermediate stages in which they are linked (Figure 1). This service cascade serves as the basic
114 template for building the BBN in this study.

115 FIGURE 1 HERE

116 In the context of environmental valuation, the classification of ecosystem services into ‘intermediate
117 processes’, ‘final services’ and ‘benefits’ addresses the problem of ‘double counting’ the values of
118 ecosystem services (Boyd and Banzhaf, 2007; Fisher and Turner, 2008; Fisher et al., 2009; Fu et al., 2011;
119 Ojea et al., 2012). For instance, in the case of a wetland, the intermediate functions of nutrient cycling and
120 water regulation interact to deliver clean water. The actual benefit that humans derive from water
121 provision may include recreation (e.g. angling, swimming, seeing water in the context of a landscape
122 (Norton et al., 2012b)) or potable water (Fisher et al., 2009). Although it seems sensible to value the
123 consumed products (tangible or intangible), the ability to acknowledge and measure the extent to which
124 the processes underlying their delivery contribute to the final value of benefits is vital. Only in this way, can

125 policy decisions affecting environmental management be valued for their impact on ecosystem services and
126 ultimately the delivery of ecosystem benefits. It is therefore important that integrated models reflect
127 relationships between final services, underlying processes and generated benefits.

128 In general, ecosystem service valuation tends to focus on one service at a time (Turner et al., 2003),
129 disregarding interactions between ecosystem functioning and services. This is in part influenced by the
130 difficulties faced by ecosystem science in considering multiple ecosystem service delivery, although it is
131 acknowledged that such an approach is essential for the sustainable management of natural systems (NRC,
132 2005; Diaz and Rosenberg 2008; Gordon et al., 2008). In addition, the available approaches to undertake
133 economic valuation of ecosystem services may themselves be inadequate for encompassing the
134 complexities of natural systems. Valuation approaches vary in the extent to which they directly value
135 individual or combinations of ecosystem services. Stated preference studies, either by virtue of the
136 constructed valuation scenario or the good being valued (e.g. public goods and/or cultural services such as
137 landscape), can be more closely linked to final ecosystem services than revealed preference, market value
138 or cost based approaches (Barkmann et al., 2008). Marketed goods, such as food, require inputs of man-
139 made and human capital (e.g. manufactured inputs, labour and knowledge) so the contribution of final
140 ecosystem services to the goods that generate human welfare is less clearly identifiable (Bateman et al.,
141 2011). These issues require care in the interpretation and use of estimated values. Therefore, benefit
142 estimates derived via stated preference valuations are likely to be of use in the context of developing
143 integrated models mirroring the ecosystem service cascade.

144 Müller et al. (2010) stress the need for an approach which integrates multiple ecosystem services (i.e. does
145 not focus only on a single service or a limited set of services). Ecosystem services-based approaches would
146 incorporate the interrelationships between ecological processes across the components of the ecosystem
147 service cascade; the different spatial and temporal scales; and incorporate stakeholders into the decision
148 making process (Hein et al., 2006; Martin-Ortega et al., 2015). Conceptually, BBN seem to be particularly
149 well fitted to address these challenges; they can be designed to fit particular study contexts and hence
150 consider spatial and temporal scales (albeit with difficulty), and can be participatory through including

151 stakeholders in the BBN development. Alternatively, BBNs may be constructed to investigate alternative
152 management scenarios for generic ecosystems as opposed to ecosystem conditions at a particular location,
153 i.e. they may be used as a tool to investigate the general effectiveness of policy interventions. This study
154 considers the latter.

155 **3 Developing an integrated ecosystem-economic model**

156 Our interdisciplinary team of terrestrial and aquatic ecologists, soil scientists and economists held three
157 workshops. Figure 2 shows the sequence of interdisciplinary workshops that took place during the
158 development of the BBN model. The first workshop included a broader group of science and policy
159 stakeholders, who together with the research team produced very complex mappings of ecosystem process
160 and service linkages for services in agricultural and freshwater systems. This served to highlight the
161 complexity of the issues rather than provide a potential approach.

162 We therefore held a smaller second workshop which focused on the specific management intervention of
163 riparian buffer strips on agricultural land. Buffer strips provide an excellent subject for study in this context
164 because they play an important role in interactions between agricultural land and freshwater ecosystems
165 and while they are used as a policy instrument, many of the policies that directly affect buffer strips are
166 conceived of and applied independently (Stutter et al., 2012). The second workshop specifically explored
167 the use of a BBN approach to model the interactions between improving water quality and mitigating flood
168 risk as two ecosystem services produced by riparian buffer strips, leading to benefits that might be valued.
169 The aim of the BBN was to explore the effectiveness of different types of riparian buffer strip management
170 at a regional scale with alternative scenarios relevant to the East and West of England offering contrasting
171 climatic, topographic and land use conditions. A final workshop was held to review the BBN model and
172 explore how it could be further developed to integrate the valuation component and to include a wider
173 range of socio-economic drivers.

174 FIGURE 2 HERE

175 Bayesian Belief Networks (BBNs) represent interactions between a range of variables, which may include
176 uncertain quantities as a directed acyclic graph which is formed by a series of interconnected nodes that
177 link actions to outcomes (Barton et al., 2008; Pollino et al., 2007; Borsuk et al., 2004). The nodes represent
178 the variables of the system, while the linkages among them indicate direct causal dependencies (Pollino et
179 al., 2007); as they are acyclic these cannot form a closed loop (Bromley et al., 2005). Those nodes that do
180 not have any conditional dependencies are called 'parent' nodes and represent input variables, while those
181 that are conditionally dependent on at least one other are called 'child' nodes. Nodes without child nodes
182 constitute the output of the system.

183 The strengths of the causal relationships among the system variables are quantified by conditional
184 probabilities. These are defined by a set of conditional probability tables (CPTs) that specify the probability
185 of each variable having a particular 'state' considering every possible combination of states of the parent
186 nodes linked to it (Kjærulff and Madsen, 2005; Kragt, 2009; Pollino et al., 2007; Bromley et al., 2005). The
187 state of the parent nodes is determined by a marginal (or unconditional) distribution of probabilities
188 (Pollino et al., 2007; Borsuk et al., 2004) set by the operator. Variables can be determined either as discrete
189 or continuous (Cain, 2001); with the state of each described by either a numerical value, a verbal
190 description, or even a true or false statement (Bromley et al., 2005). The probability values can be either
191 observed data, information elicited from experts or a combination of sources (Pollino et al., 2007).

192 **3.1 Riparian buffer strips**

193 Riparian buffer strips are vegetated strips of land that extend along the side of a watercourse which are set
194 aside from production by farmers, often under agri-environment agreement (Stutter et al., 2012). Buffer
195 strips are primarily encouraged in order to exclude nutrients, sediment and other organic matter from the
196 watercourse (Ramilan et al., 2010), but may also play important roles in flood control, water retention and
197 infiltration, climate regulation, habitat provision, recreation and amenity (Tabachi et al., 2000; NRC, 2002;
198 Dwire and Lowerence, 2006; Soman et al., 2007). It is recognised that there is a range of interdependencies
199 associated with the provision of the ecosystem services outlined above. For instance, decreases in the
200 infiltration capacity of any riparian area will affect both productive capacity and water quality through

201 decreasing nutrient uptake by plant roots, decreasing water storage and increasing surface runoff, thereby
202 impacting on flood risk, recreational activities, water supply, etc.

203 The use of riparian vegetation as buffer strips was examined from a perspective of alternative management
204 practices, i.e. a) grassland; b) natural vegetation; c) mixed (i.e. a and b); or d) no buffer strip. The impacts of
205 these characteristics of buffer strips are documented in the literature (Siameti, 2012); further
206 characteristics such as width and vegetation height will modify impacts but we assume these are implicit in
207 the management of each buffer strip type. The functions provided by riparian buffer strips were
208 incorporated into their effects on a) runoff rate, b) sedimentation load and c) water temperature. Effects of
209 alternative land uses (i.e. arable or pasture), soil type, slope, as well as seasonal effects on water
210 temperature and aquatic vegetation were also taken into consideration.

211 **3.2 BBN construction**

212 The initial stage in the development of a BBN was to construct a conceptual model specifying the cause-
213 and-effect relationships among the system components. This process began during our second workshop.
214 The conceptual model formed the basis for the directed acyclic graph. Firstly, the objectives (output nodes)
215 of the model were defined; in this case: flood risk and water quality. The output nodes represent the
216 ‘physical’ outcomes of the model (services) and are distinct from ‘value’ outcomes (benefits) which are
217 captured in further utility nodes. We define the output nodes for the BBN as follows:

218 *Flood risk:* riparian buffer strips contribute to moderating flood risk either by delaying the passage of
219 floodwater downstream or reducing surface runoff through infiltration or interception of precipitation..

220 *Water quality:* riparian buffer strips may enhance water quality through a number of processes. These
221 include; direct interception of nutrient containing sediments, interception and infiltration of water, shading
222 of the watercourse and nutrient cycling within the vegetation. The net effect of such processes is to reduce
223 the nutrients reaching the associated water and reduce temperatures.

224 Once the output nodes and the policy tool (node ‘buffer strips’) were defined, development of the BBN
225 drew on system variables and their interrelationships, as identified in our first and second workshops

226 exploring the ecological processes involved in provision of water quality and flood risk specifically relating
227 to farmland (summarised in Table 1). Given that the lower number of nodes a model has, the more easily
228 understood it will be by the involved parties (Cain, 2001; Marcot et al., 2006) the challenge was to select
229 the variables which would provide a realistic representation of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems whilst at
230 the same time keeping the model as simple as possible. The variables that were agreed during the second
231 and third workshops for use in the model can broadly be divided into four groups: states of nature,
232 terrestrial processes, management intervention and aquatic processes. The states of nature variables
233 represent the local conditions which determine the variables of the terrestrial and aquatic processes, which
234 together with the 'management intervention' variables indirectly or directly determine the final ecosystem
235 services, flood risk and water quality. The individual variables have been defined and assessed for their
236 dependencies in the scope of this study. The definitions and the results of the assessments are summarised
237 in Table 1. In addition the table includes the assumptions that are used in the parameterization process.

238 TABLE 1 HERE

239 Flood risk was modelled as a variable determined by the level of river flow. It is affected indirectly by the
240 surface runoff rate, the rainfall rate and aquatic vegetation. This is a simplification of a complex system
241 where river flow is not the sole determinant of flood risk but it reflects our focus on a small number of key
242 processes. Water quality can be defined by a range of biological, chemical, hydrological and morphological
243 characteristics, such as levels of dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, soluble nutrient content, fish
244 populations etc. (UK NEA, 2011). In this study, Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) was selected as the water
245 quality indicator because of its importance as an indicator of biological quality and the availability of
246 evidence related to factors impacting upon it. Water temperature, water nutrient concentration and
247 aquatic vegetation coverage are considered to have an indirect impact on water quality through their effect
248 on BOD, although these factors in themselves can also directly impact on water quality.

249 The BBN was created using Netica software (Norsys, 2003) and was further developed to include decision,
250 nature and utility nodes. Decision nodes are associated to factors controlled by decision makers, while
251 utility nodes represent those variables that need to be optimised (i.e. system outputs). Thus, 'riparian

252 buffer strips' was depicted as a decision node, while the end-points of the system were connected to a
253 utility node, 'satisfaction'. We use the term 'satisfaction' due to its link to the economic concept of utility
254 and also because it is not linked to any specific unit or estimate of value within the current model. The
255 values for all the other variables were dependent on probability relationships with other variables,
256 expressed as conditional probability distributions, and were drawn as nature nodes. Our BBN model is
257 illustrated in Figure 3.

258 FIGURE 3 HERE

259 **4 Model parameterisation**

260 Once the conceptual network was designed, the next step was to populate each CPT with probability
261 values. Since the model is generic rather than site-based, the parameterisation process was based on
262 evaluations of the general patterns of riparian ecosystem functioning relevant to buffer strips, drawn from
263 the literature and from expert knowledge (see Table 1 assumptions).

264 All the system components were identified as discrete variables; these were chosen to simplify
265 parameterisation in absence of data to populate continuous variables. Decision and parent nodes are
266 deterministic with their states provided by decision makers (Castelletti and Soncini-Sessa, 2007; Cain,
267 2001); hence, these nodes did not need to be populated in the same way. . The generic probabilities used in
268 this model were intended to reflect contrasts between the different states of the variables (e.g. low,
269 medium, high) rather than absolute values. The use of observed data might lead to more robust results, but
270 as emphasised previously would limit the potential to derive general policy recommendations for
271 alternative scenarios. We argue that the benefit of the BBN approach in this context lies in developing an
272 understanding of processes and their interactions as part of a decision support tool. The CPT for Overland
273 flow is presented in Table 2 as an example of our approach.

274 TABLE 2 HERE

275 As we were unaware of any joint valuations of flood risk and water quality, the values used to parameterise
276 satisfaction were developed by the authors. This was treated as a continuous variable ranging from 0 to

277 100; effectively this was an index of the benefits associated with different combinations of states for the
278 flood risk and water quality outcomes: low flood risk and high water quality = 100; high flood risk and poor
279 water quality = 0, other combinations were assigned values in between; these are presented in Table 3.
280 Although the utility values presented in Table 3 appear to be discrete values, the utility node itself must be
281 defined as continuous to allow compilation of the network and subsequent estimation of the probability
282 weighted utilities associated with different management actions in the decision node. Between the upper
283 and lower bounds of high water quality/low flood risk and poor water quality/high flood risk there is an
284 inherent trade-off between water quality and flood risk where the benefit of improving one of these can
285 potentially result in a worse outcome for the other. In determining the values for 'satisfaction' we made the
286 assumption that regardless of water quality status the overall score could not exceed 50 if flood risk was
287 high; utility lies between 35 and 65 for medium flood risk; and where flood risk is low utility will always be
288 greater than 50.

289 To parameterise the CPT states for water quality, we drew on the water quality ladder first introduced by
290 Carson and Mitchell (1993) that describes water quality on an ascending scale of water-use possibilities.
291 The worst quality category is associated with severe limitations on use, while improving water quality
292 allows for a range of activities, such as, for example, boating and swimming. Different forms of the water
293 quality ladder inspired by this original one have been extensively used in the water valuation literature (see
294 Baker et al., 2007; Del-Saz-Salazar et al., 2009; Brouwer et al., 2010; Glenk et al., 2011; Ramajo-Hernandez
295 and Del-Saz-Salazar, 2012; Metcalfe et al., 2012; Schaafsma et al., 2012). Maybe the most advanced of
296 these, is that by Hime et al. (2009), who produced a generic water quality ladder built on various indicators
297 of water quality levels, including; fish life, aquatic vegetation, river bank vegetation, substrate composition
298 and water clarity. This relatively sophisticated ladder has been tested in several European countries
299 (Bateman et. al 2011) and is the one used in this study. Each of the ecological categories is associated to
300 different water quality levels, which Hime et al. (2009) define as blue, green, yellow, and red respectively
301 (from the highest to the lowest quality). Each level of water quality was further linked to the defined states
302 of BOD as described in Table 1.

303 We assume that there is less sensitivity to water quality state with no distinction made between the utility
304 for the blue and green levels (this reflect the role of inherent characteristics such as substrate type in
305 differentiating these levels which might not be affected by riparian management); so the BBN will in effect
306 only reflect the utility associated with changes in the probability of water quality being either poor (red),
307 moderate (yellow) or good (green and blue).

308 Once all CPTs were populated with probability values the model was compiled and the decision network
309 'solved'. That means that the software performed standard belief updating and calculated the 'marginal
310 posterior probability' for each variable (Marcot et al., 2006), showing the 'optimal solution' of the problem.
311 The inclusion of both decision (management actions) and utility nodes means that when the model is
312 'solved' the utility values associated with each management action are obtained thus allowing the optimal
313 action to be identified.

314 TABLE 3 HERE

315 For each combination of land use and buffer strip management a utility score is calculated as the sum of
316 the utility values associated with each combination of flood risk and water quality outcome (i.e. Table 3)
317 multiplied by the probabilities of those outcomes occurring:

$$318 \quad U_m = \sum_{s=1}^S PrFR_{ms} \times PrWQ_{ms} \times U_s \quad (1)$$

319 Where U_m is the utility associated with management option m ; $PrFR_{ms}$ is the probability of flood risk
320 outcome s occurring under management option m ; $PrWQ_{ms}$ is the probability of water quality outcome s
321 occurring under option m ; and U_s is the utility associated with combined flood risk and water quality
322 outcomes s .

323 **4.1 Model scenarios**

324 The BBN was used to explore the effectiveness of the management intervention at regional scales. The
325 model was able to explore all possible combinations of our 'states of nature' based on the parents nodes:
326 region (2 states), slope (3 states), season (4 states), land cover (3 states) and soil type (3 states); this would
327 give $2^1 \times 3^3 \times 4^1 = 72$ possible combinations, although some may be unlikely given the general geographical

328 characteristics of the two regions. For brevity in this paper we evaluate a sub-set of three scenarios
329 defined using typical combinations of region, land-use, soil type and slope (Table 4). These three scenarios
330 were examined under alternative buffer strip management practices with 'no buffer strips' being referred
331 as the 'status quo', in which it is assumed that vegetation in the riparian zone is managed for agricultural
332 production whether grassland or arable such that the ecosystem processes associated with buffer strips are
333 diminished. In particular the runoff rate and sedimentation load associated with these land uses are
334 unmodified in the absence of buffer strips. The different buffer strip options 'no buffer strips', 'grassland',
335 'natural vegetation' and 'mixed' can be simultaneously evaluated, i.e. the BBN returns the utility values for
336 all four. For each given 'state of nature' scenario, our aim was to: (i) identify the optimal buffer strip
337 management practice; and (ii) compare how the system objectives changed between the 'status quo' and
338 the 'optimal solution'. The BBN can also take seasonal changes (associated with the rainfall rate, vegetation
339 coverage and temperature) into account, however for the examples we present in the results specific
340 seasons are not selected which means they represent year-round or average seasonal conditions. From a
341 decision support perspective this signifies an evaluation of buffer strip performance throughout the year.

342 TABLE 4 HERE

343

344 **5 Results**

345 Table 5 presents the utility or satisfaction values associated with each of the scenarios for the different
346 buffer strip management options and Table 6 shows the changes in the probabilities of the management
347 objectives occurring under each of these options. In scenario A, where there is a low level of overland flow
348 (i.e. East England: low rainfall; light soils with high infiltration capacity; low slope), natural vegetation
349 proved to be the optimal buffer zone management practice (satisfaction score: 59.37) on arable land (Table
350 5). The model showed that a moderate level of flood risk was most probable, together with a moderate
351 (yellow) level of water quality. The results indicate that the optimal solution would affect both system
352 objectives positively, i.e. the probabilities of low flood risk level and high (blue) level of water quality were
353 both improved (Table 6).

354 TABLE 5 HERE

355 TABLE 6 HERE

356 In contrast to Scenario A, the conditions of Scenario B (Table 5) are associated with a higher level of
357 overland flow (i.e. West of England: high rainfall; heavy soil with low infiltration capacity; medium slope).
358 Under this scenario, a moderate level of flood risk and a good (green) level of water quality were most
359 likely to occur. This result arises because on average there is a higher density of vegetation coverage under
360 scenario B due to the selected land use, i.e. grassland (see assumptions in Table 1). In this scenario, natural
361 vegetation also proved to be the optimal buffer strip management practice (satisfaction value: 59.91 –
362 Table 5). Table 6 shows the changes in the probabilities of the management objectives occurring when this
363 solution was applied. Again both flood risk and water quality are positively affected with patterns and
364 magnitudes similar to scenario A.

365 The conditions of Scenario C are similar to Scenario B, but with steeper slopes. Again Natural vegetation
366 was the optimal buffer strip solution, but with less overall utility (score: 59.25 – Table 5) than in scenario B
367 (score: 59.91 – Table 5). Regardless of the steeper slope, in this scenario the optimal solution led to a
368 greater improvement in flood control (Table 6) than in the previous scenario. This is because under the
369 status quo, flood risk is likely to be higher as steeper slopes increase surface flow rates. As a result, riparian
370 buffer strips have a greater impact on flood control and are hence more effective in areas with steeper
371 slopes.

372 For each of the scenario results in Table 5 we also present the percentage change in utility relative to the
373 status quo situation. This reveals that the application of buffer strips in scenario C has the largest relative
374 impact on utility, although this scenario is associated with the lowest absolute levels of utility. Given the
375 underlying assumptions of the BBN parameterisation it is not surprising that 'natural vegetation' is the
376 optimal buffer strip solution in each scenario. However, our model does not consider the costs or
377 opportunity costs of the buffer strip options; these would be needed to fully evaluate whether the gains in
378 utility or changes in the probabilities of water quality and flood risk are sufficient to justify particular buffer

379 strip options. The changes in utility in Table 5 as represented in percentage terms suggest that each of the
380 buffer strip options performs relatively better in scenarios B and C compared to A. This is particularly the
381 case with grassland buffer strips, but less so with natural vegetation or mixed buffer strips. From a policy
382 perspective this can affect recommendations for both regional targeting of buffer strips and the types being
383 promoted.

384 In Table 6 we can observe that the changes in the probabilities of preferred outcomes are higher for flood
385 risk than for water quality. The increase in the probabilities of low flood risk and reduction in probability of
386 high flood risk are much larger than changes in probabilities for either high (blue) or poor (red) water
387 quality status.

388

389 **6 Discussion**

390 Our analysis explored a BBN using a framework that is suited to the integration of ecological and economic
391 knowledge. The model was based on a review of the biophysical relationships between the ecosystem
392 processes that lead to final ecosystem services and ultimately benefits that can be valued. Essentially we
393 have unpacked and operationalized the ecosystem services cascade developed by Haines-Young and
394 Potschin (2009). An important step in this operationalization was the introduction of specific management
395 actions to which we can attribute utility values. The utility values used were determined for the specific
396 purpose of this study, and serve to demonstrate the way final services and underlying processes can be
397 related to an outcome that may be defined either in economic terms or that could be informed from non-
398 monetary approaches such as identifying weights or scores using multicriteria analysis. Specifically, the BBN
399 demonstrates that the utility associated with buffer strips is dependent on the supporting ecosystem
400 processes and functions (e.g. soil, vegetation, organisms) and wider geographical and climactic contexts. It
401 is in principle possible within the BBN to select specific levels of underpinning natural capital or ecosystem
402 processes (e.g. infiltration, overland flow) and to evaluate their impact on the utility of buffer strip options
403 in the decision node; in effect this potentially allows us to value those processes and states. There are a
404 number of interesting consequences of the BBN approach that warrant further investigation.

405 As noted by Landuyt et al. (2013), the parameterisation of utility nodes can be informed by monetary
406 valuation with stated preference methods being described as producing values that are compatible with
407 BBNs. At first glance, choice experiments may appear to be most suitable for investigations of changes in
408 multiple ecosystem service delivery because they allow valuation of multiple attributes. However, the
409 attributes should not be causally related, i.e. benefits associated with a change in one ecosystem service
410 (attribute) must be assumed to vary independently from other benefits. In cases where benefits are
411 generated jointly as a result of a management intervention, contingent valuation will be more appropriate.
412 The BBN model is also open to non-monetary valuation, for example through participatory ranking or
413 weighting exercises. This approach would be of use where cultural and shared social values are of interest
414 (UK NEA, 2011).

415 The nature of the outcomes produced by the BBN highlight an important consideration for valuation. The
416 water quality and flood risk outcomes of the ecosystem processes represented in the model are
417 probabilities for different states. This has the advantage of reflecting the inherent uncertainty of such
418 outcomes in natural systems; however this may be problematic from an economic valuation perspective.
419 The probabilistic nature of the outcomes raises questions with respect to the formation of values where
420 those values themselves might also be uncertain (see for example Hanley et al., 2009). For example, if we
421 were to develop a stated preference study of water quality states, would the willingness to pay for 'high'
422 water quality be reduced where the probability of that outcome is low? And, could that value be lower than
423 that stated for 'good' water quality where that outcome has a higher probability? The combined effects of
424 outcome and value uncertainty might mean we are unable to differentiate between the values of
425 outcomes.

426 The utility values, as currently expressed, refer to particular combinations of outcomes. But the model
427 omits a necessary step in valuation which is to determine the value associated with moving between those
428 outcomes, i.e. the management options are not evaluated with reference to a counterfactual. For example,
429 to determine economic value we might elicit willingness to pay to move from a situation of no buffer strips
430 to one with natural vegetation buffer strips; under scenario A we would be seeking the value of moving

431 from a satisfaction value of 55.4 to one of 59.4. As it stands the BBN does not tell us how the status quo
432 utility value of 55.4 was determined. Essentially, the BBN approach allows us to ascribe values to states of
433 the world without consideration of how those states relate to alternative outcomes under different
434 management or policy interventions (e.g. grass buffer strips versus no buffer strips). However, determining
435 weights or 'values' for outcomes without reference to a counterfactual may be acceptable in a decision
436 support context; such weights could be determined through participatory research, multicriteria analysis or
437 expert judgement. If the aim of the model is to quantify monetary or non-monetary values this indicates a
438 limitation of a fully integrated BBN. It would be necessary to make assumptions about how outcomes shift
439 across categories. For example, would flood risk status be more likely to move between adjacent
440 categories, medium to low rather than from high to low? Valuation counterfactuals would need to reflect
441 the movement of outcomes between categories.

442 An implication of the probabilistic outcomes is the need to explore thresholds or other non-linearities that
443 influence preferences and values. For instance, in Scenario C, the optimal management action (grassland
444 with natural vegetation buffer strips) sees an increase in probability of a low flood risk state from 21.3% to
445 27.7% with a concurrent decline in a high flood risk state from 32.5% to 24.2% (see Table 5). The question is
446 whether there is some threshold level of reduction in high flood risk that must be crossed to allow the
447 benefits of the increased probability of low flood risk to be realised, i.e. is there an acceptable maximum
448 probability of flood risk being high? For example, the value of an increase in the probability of achieving a
449 low flood risk state may be contingent on the probability of being in a high flood risk state falling below
450 some specific level (e.g. 20%). Conversely, there may be thresholds above which the most desirable
451 outcomes are sufficient to compensate for continuing risks of undesirable outcomes, e.g. low flood risk at
452 the expense of 'medium' water quality levels. Valuation methods generally assume that ecosystem services
453 are provided at a steady rate (i.e. linearly). However, there are many instances where interrelationships
454 among the ecosystem services are remarkably non-linear (Farber et al., 2002; Koch et al., 2009; van
455 Jaarsveld et al., 2005). Further, across multiple ecosystem services, there may be complex and interrelated
456 non-linearities in preferences. Such non-linearities might reflect lexicographic preferences where there is
457 no acceptable trade-off between probabilities of desirable and undesirable outcomes.

458 The model as formulated shows little apparent variation in utility values (Table 5) and probabilities of
459 outcomes (Table 6), this reflects our choice of parameterisation for generic scenarios (i.e. two regions
460 across multiple soil types, slopes and land uses). A more context specific parameterisation of values in the
461 conditional probability tables may be necessary for studies investigating particular places. This may only be
462 accommodated through either splitting the model into separate regions or land uses or by considerably
463 increasing its complexity. The question then becomes one of whether we want to understand the processes
464 involved or accurately model the outcomes.

465 Understanding the potential for extending the original BBN to more accurately represent both the
466 biophysical and socio-economic elements of the system and place raises an important further issue. The
467 attraction of the BBN approach is its relative simplicity and flexible data requirements. As models increase
468 in complexity and realism the development task and data requirements become more exacting. Hence,
469 there is ultimately a further trade-off between precision and usefulness which will depend on the needs of
470 decision makers. But in situations where it is necessary to develop a joint understanding of ecosystem
471 functioning, perhaps across multiple stakeholders, the relative simplicity of the BBN approach may be
472 sufficient to make optimal decisions.

473 Our BBN model does not explicitly consider the socio-economic determinants of the values in the utility
474 node. It is well recognised in the valuation literature (e.g. Garrod et al., 2012) that there is heterogeneity of
475 preferences and that it is determined partly by a number of contextual factors. We propose a possible
476 extension to the BBN (Figure 4) that incorporates socio-economic factors that might influence 'satisfaction'
477 values for both water quality (income, type of recreational use, availability of substitutes, site amenities)
478 and flood control (income, proximity). We have not evaluated this model as the additional socio-economic
479 factors would need to be parameterised through further research (e.g. public workshops or surveys) that
480 were beyond our project resources. In this extension the utility associated with water quality and flood
481 control is separated, i.e. both provide benefits independently of one another. Although there are
482 compelling reasons for joint consideration of utility, the benefiting populations may be different. The utility

483 values in the decision node ('buffer strips') would still reflect the 'joint' value of the outcomes but without
484 any implicit information on trade-offs between flood risk and water quality.

485 This extension is not intended to be comprehensive, but would allow us to explore the sensitivity of the
486 BBN to both bio-physical and socio-economic assumptions. Further extensions could include additional
487 terrestrial ecosystem services (landscape, biodiversity, recreation etc.) and the socio-economic factors
488 influencing land manager decision making (Yu and Belcher 2011; Curtis and Robertson 2003). The latter
489 would be important particularly if considering multiple measures or the relative value of public and private
490 benefits (e.g. farm incomes) in policy making. This supply-side element of management remains a gap in
491 ecosystem service evaluation and could add considerably greater complexity to an integrated model as
492 willingness to adopt buffer strips has been shown to be dependent on a mix of economic, attitudinal and
493 farm structural factors, in particular where there is interference with production (Buckley et al. 2012).

494 FIGURE 4 HERE

495 **7 Conclusions**

496 This research has proposed a novel way of operationalizing an ecosystem services-based approach
497 following the ecosystem services cascade proposed by Haines-Young et al. (2009) for the identification and
498 assessment of benefits of environmental interventions (in this case, riparian buffer strips). For that we have
499 tested the potential of BBN as a tool for integrating knowledge across disciplines and dealing with
500 information gaps and uncertainty. Our research represents a step further in the development and
501 unpacking of (so far) theoretical frameworks for the conceptualization of ecosystem services delivery.

502 Interesting issues arise from the use of a BBN approach due to its probabilistic nature, as this both captures
503 the uncertainty inherent in natural systems and raises questions over their incorporation in valuation and
504 wider decision making where uncertainties over preferences are pervasive. The way these probabilities
505 interact with non-linearities, thresholds, uncertainty in valuation and the statistical properties of valuation
506 estimates (e.g. distributions and confidence intervals) will be key research areas if these approaches are to
507 be used in interdisciplinary modelling and integrated decision support. Users of such models will also need

508 to understand the trade-off between realism, precision and the benefits of developing joint understanding
509 of the decision context.

510 **Acknowledgements**

511 This research has been developed in the context of the Valuing Nature Network (VNN) project ‘Valuing the
512 impacts of ecosystem service interactions for policy effectiveness’ funded by the Natural Environment
513 Research Council (UK). We thank the wider group of academics and stakeholders who were involved in the
514 first workshop for this VNN and contributed to the refinement of our research goals. Specific thanks are
515 due to colleagues at The James Hutton Institute (Matt Aitkenhead, Helaina Black, Wendy Kenyon and
516 Rupert Hough) and the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology (Simon Smart and Francois Edwards) for their
517 inputs into the research. This research was also supported by the Scottish Government Rural Affairs and the
518 Environment Portfolio Strategic Research Programme 2011-2016, Theme 1 (Environmental Change:
519 Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity).

520

521 **References**

- 522 Ames, D.P., Nielson, B.T., Stevens, D.K. and Lall, U. (2005) Using Bayesian networks to model watershed
523 management decisions: an East Canyon Creek case study, *Journal of Hydroinformatics* 7 (04): 267–282.
- 524 Baker, B., Metcalfe, P., Butler, S., Gueron, Y., Sheldon, R. and East, J. (2007) *Report on the Benefits of WFD*
525 *Programmes of Measure in England and Wales*. Defra, UK.
- 526 Barkmann, J., Glenk, K., Keil, A., Leemhuis, C., Dietrich, N., Gerold, G. and Marggraf, R. (2008) Confronting
527 unfamiliarity with ecosystem functions: The case for an ecosystem service approach to environmental
528 valuation with stated preference methods, *Ecological Economics* 65: 48-62.
- 529 Barton, D.N., Saloranta, T., Moe, S.J., Eggestad, H.O. and Kuikka, S. (2008) Bayesian belief networks as a
530 meta-modelling tool in integrated river basin management - Pros and cons in evaluating nutrient
531 abatement decisions under uncertainty in a Norwegian river basin, *Ecological Economics* 66: 91-104.
- 532 Bateman, I., Mace, G., Fezzi, C., Atkinson, G., and Turner, K. (2011) Economic Analysis for Ecosystem
533 Service Assessments, *Environmental and Resource Economics* 48(2): 177-218.
- 534 Borsuk, M.E., Stow, C.A. and Reckhow, K.H. (2004) A Bayesian network of eutrophication models for
535 synthesis, prediction, and uncertainty analysis, *Ecological Modelling* 173: 219–239.
- 536 Boyd, J. and Banzhaf, S. (2007) What are ecosystem services? The need for standardized environmental
537 accounting units, *Ecological Economics* 63 (2–3): 616–626.

538 Brauman, K.A., Daily, G.C., Duarte, T. and Mooney, H.A. (2007) The Nature and Value of Ecosystem
539 Services: An Overview Highlighting Hydrologic Services, *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 32(1):
540 67-98.

541 Bromley, J., Jackson, N.A., Clymer, O.J., Giacomello, A.M. and Jensen, F.V. (2005) The use of Hugin to
542 develop Bayesian networks as an aid to integrated water resource planning, *Environmental Modelling and*
543 *Software* 20: 231-242.

544 Brouwer, R., Martin-Ortega, J. and Berbel, J. (2010) Spatial preference heterogeneity: a choice experiment,
545 *Land Economics* 86(3): 552–568.

546 Buckley, C., Hynes, S. and Mehan, S. (2012) Supply of an ecosystem service – Farmers’ willingness to adopt
547 riparian buffer zones in agricultural catchments, *Environmental Science and Policy* 24: 101-109.

548 Cain, J. (2001). *Planning improvements in natural resources management: Guidelines for using Bayesian*
549 *networks to support the planning and management of development programmes in the water sector and*
550 *beyond*, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, UK.

551 Carpenter, S.R., Mooney, H.A., Agard, J., Capistrano, D., Defries, R.S., Diaz, S., Dietz, T., Duraipappah, A.K.,
552 Oteng-Yeboah, A., Pereira, H.M., Perrings, C., Reid, W.V., Sarukhan, J., Scholes R.J. and Whyte, A. (2009)
553 Science for managing ecosystem services: beyond the millennium ecosystem assessment, *Proceedings of*
554 *The National Academy of Sciences* 106(5): 1305–1312.

555 Carson, R.T., Mitchell, R.C. (1993) The Value of Clean Water: The Public's Willingness to Pay for Boatable,
556 Fishable, and Swimmable Quality Water, *Water Resources Research* 29: 2445-54.

557 Castelletti, A. and Soncini-Sessa, R. (2007) Bayesian networks and participatory modelling in water resource
558 management, *Environmental Modelling and Software* 22 (8): 1075–1088.

559 Clark, J.S., Carpenter, S.R., Barber, M., Collins, S., Dobson, A., Foley, J.A., Lodge, D.M., Pascual, M. and
560 Pielke, J.R. (2001) Ecological forecasts: an emerging imperative, *Science* 293: 657–660.

561 Curtis, A. and Robertson, A. (2003) Understanding landholder management of river frontages: the Goulburn
562 Broken, *Ecological Management and Restoration* 4: 45-54.

563 Defra (2007) *An introductory guide to valuing ecosystem services*, Defra London, UK..

564 Del-Saz-Salazar, S., Hernández-Sancho, F., Sala-Garrido, R. (2009) The social benefits of restoring water
565 quality in the context of the WFD: a comparison of willingness to pay and willingness to accept, *Science of*
566 *the Total Environment* 407(16): 4574–4583.

567 Diaz, R.J. and Rosenberg, R. (2008) Spreading dead zones and consequences for marine ecosystems, *Science*
568 321: 926–929.

569 Doody, D.G., Archbold, M., Foy, R.H. and Flynn, R. (2012) Approaches to the implementation of the Water
570 Framework Directive: targeting mitigation measures at critical source areas of diffuse phosphorus in Irish
571 catchments, *Journal of Environmental Management* 93: 225-234.

572 Dwire, K.A. and Lowrance, R.R. (2006) Riparian ecosystems and buffers-multiscale structure, function, and
573 management: introduction, *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 42: 1-4.

- 574 Farber, S., Costanza, R. and Wilson, M. (2002) Economic and ecological concepts for valuing ecosystem
575 services, *Ecological Economics* 41: 375–392.
- 576 Fisher, B. and Turner, R.K. (2008) Ecosystem services: classification for valuation, *Biological Conservation*
577 141(5): 1167–1169.
- 578 Fisher, B., Turner, R.K. and Morling, P. (2009) Defining and classifying ecosystem services for decision
579 making, *Ecological Economics* 68 (3): 643–653.
- 580 Fu, B., Su, C, Wei, Y., Willett, I.R., Lu, Y. and Liu, G. (2011) Double counting in ecosystem services valuation:
581 causes and countermeasures, *Ecological Research* 26(1): 1-14.
- 582 Garrod, G., Ruto, E., Willis, K. and Powe, N. (2012) Heterogeneity of preferences for the benefits of
583 Environmental Stewardship: A latent-class approach, *Ecological Economics* 76: 104-111.
- 584 Glenk, K., Lago, M. and Moran, D. (2011) Public preferences for water quality improvements: implications
585 for the implementation of the EC WFD in Scotland, *Water Policy* 13(5): 645–662.
- 586 Gordon, L.J., Peterson, G.D. and Bennett, E.M. (2008). Agricultural modifications of hydrological flows
587 create ecological surprises, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 23: 211–219.
- 588 Gu, Y., McNicol, J., Peiris, D., Crawford, J., Marshall, B. and Jefferies, R. (1996) A belief network-based
589 system for predicting future crop production, *AI Applications* 10(1): 13-24.
- 590 Haas, T.C., Mowrer, H.T. and Shepperd, W.D. (1994). Modeling aspen stand growth with a temporal Bayes
591 network, *AI Applications* 8(1): 15–28.
- 592 Haines-Young, R., (2011) Exploring ecosystem services issues across diverse knowledge domain using
593 Bayesian Belief Networks, *Progress in Physical Geography* 35(5), 681-699
- 594 Haines-Young, R.H. and Potschin, M.B. (2009) *Methodologies for defining and assessing ecosystem services*,
595 CEM (Centre of Environmental Management) Final Report, JNCC.
- 596 Hamilton G.S., Fielding, F., Chiffings, A.W., Hart, B.T., Johnstone, R.W. and Mangerson, K.L. (2007)
597 Investigating the use of a Bayesian Network to model the risk of *Lyngbya Majuscula* bloom initiation in
598 Deception Bay, Queensland, *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment* 13(6): 1271-1287.
- 599 Hanley, N., Kriström, B. and Shogren, J.F. (2009) Coherent Arbitrariness: On Value Uncertainty for
600 Environmental Goods, *Land Economics* 85(1): 41–50.
- 601 Haygarth, P.M., ApSimon, H., Betson, M., Harris, D., Hodgkinson, R. and Withers, P.J.A. (2009) Mitigating
602 diffuse phosphorus transfer from agriculture according to cost and efficiency, *Journal of Environmental*
603 *Quality* 38: 2012-2022.
- 604 Heal, G., Daily, G.C., Ehrlich, P.R., Salzman, J.C., Boggs, J., Hellman, J., Hughes, C., Kremen, C. and Ricketts, T.
605 (2001) Protecting natural capital through ecosystem service districts, *Stanford Environmental Law Journal*
606 20: 333–364.
- 607 Hein, L., van Koppen, K., de Groot, R.S. and van Ierland, E.C. (2006) Spatial scales, stakeholders and the
608 valuation of ecosystem services, *Ecological Economics* 57(2): 209-228.

- 609 Henriksen, H.J., Rasmussen, P., Brandt, G., von Bülowb, D. and Jensen, F.V., (2004) *Engaging stakeholders in*
610 *construction and validation of Bayesian belief networks for groundwater protection*, Mimeo, Geological
611 Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS).
- 612 Hime, S., Bateman, I.J., Posen, P. and Hutchins, M. (2009) *A transferable water quality ladder for conveying*
613 *use and ecological information within public surveys*, CSERGE Working Paper EDM 09-01, Centre for Social
614 and Economic Research on the Global Environment, University of East Anglia.
- 615 Hooper B., editor (2005) *Integrated River Basin Governance*, London:IWA Publishing.
- 616 van Jaarsveld, A.S., Biggs, R., Scholes, R.J., Bohensky, E., Reyers, B. Lynam, T., Musvoto, C. and Fabricius, C.
617 (2005) Measuring conditions and trends in ecosystem services at multiple scales: the Southern African
618 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (SAfMA) experience, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-*
619 *Biological Sciences* 360: 425–441.
- 620 Kjærulff, U.B. and Madsen, A.L. (2005) *Probabilistic Networks — An Introduction to Bayesian Networks and*
621 *Influence Diagrams*, Department of Computer Science, Aalborg University and HUGIN Expert A/S.
- 622 Koch, E.W., Barbier, E.B., Silliman, B.R., Reed, D.J., Perillo, G.M.E., Hacker, S.D., Granek, E.F., Primavera, J.H.,
623 Muthiga, N., Polasky, S., Halpern, B.S., Kennedy, C.J., Kappel, C.V. and Wolanski, E. (2009) Non-linearity in
624 ecosystem services: temporal and spatial variability in coastal protection, *Frontiers in Ecology and the*
625 *Environment* 7(1): 29–37.
- 626 Kragt, M.E. (2009) *A beginners guide to Bayesian network modelling for integrated catchment*
627 *management*, Landscape Logic Technical Report No. 9, Australian Government – Department of the
628 Environment, Water, heritage and Arts.
- 629 Kremen, C. and Ostfeld, R.S. (2005) A call to ecologists: measuring, analyzing, and managing ecosystem
630 services, *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 3: 540–548.
- 631 Kuikka, S. and Varis, O. (1997) Uncertainties of climatic change impacts in Finnish watersheds: a Bayesian
632 network analysis of expert knowledge, *Boreal Environment Research* 2: 109–128.
- 633 Kuikka, S., Hilden, M., Gislason, H., Hansson, S., Sparholt, H. and Varis, O. (1999) *Modeling environmentally*
634 *driven uncertainties in Baltic cod (Gadus morhua) management by Bayesian influence diagrams*, Canadian
635 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 56: 629–641.
- 636 Landuyt, D., Broekx, S., D’hondt, R., Engelen, G., Aertsens, J. and Goethals, P.L.M. (2013) A review of
637 Bayesian belief networks in ecosystem services modelling, *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 46: 1-11.
- 638 Lee, D.C. and Rieman, B.E. (1997) Population viability assessment of salmonids by using probabilistic
639 networks, *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 17: 1144–1157.
- 640 Marcot, B.G., Steventon, J.D., Sutherland, G.D. and McCann, R.K. (2006) Guidelines for developing and
641 updating Bayesian belief networks applied to ecological modeling and conservation, *Canadian Journal of*
642 *Forest Research* 36 (12): 3063-3074.
- 643 Martin-Ortega, J., Jorda-Capdevilla, D., Glenk, K. and Holstead, K. (2015) *What defines ecosystem services-*
644 *based approaches?* In: Martin-Ortega, J., Ferrier, R., Gordon, I. and Kahn, S. *Water Ecosystem Services: A*
645 *Global Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

646 Maskell, L.C., Crowe, A., Dunbar, M.J., Emmett, B., Henrys, P., Keith, A.M., Norton, L.R., Scholefield, P.,
647 Clark, D.B., Simpson, I.C. and Smart, S.M. (2013) Exploring the ecological constraints to multiple ecosystem
648 service delivery and biodiversity, *Journal of Applied Ecology* 50: 561-571.

649 Metcalfe, P.J., Baker, W., Andrews, K., Atkinson, G., Bateman, I.J., Butler, S., Carson, R.T., East, J., Gueron,
650 Y., Sheldon, R. and Train, K. (2012) An assessment of the nonmarket benefits of the water framework
651 directive for households in England and Wales, *Water Resources Research* 48(3): W03526

652 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) (2005) *Ecosystems and human well-being: a framework for*
653 *assessment*, Island Press, Washington DC.

654 Müller, F., de Groot, R. and Willemsen, L. (2010). Ecosystem Services at the Landscape Scale: The Need for
655 Integrative Approaches, *Landscape Online* 23: 1-11.

656 National Research Council, U.S. (NRC) (2002) *Riparian areas: functions and strategies for management*,
657 Washington, DC National Academies Press.

658 National Research Council, U.S. (NRC) (2002) *Riparian area: functions and strategies for management*,
659 Washington, DC National Academies Press.

660 National Research Council, U.S. (NRC) (2005) *Valuing ecosystem services: toward better environmental*
661 *decision making*, Washington, DC National Academies Press.

662 Norsys Software Corp. (2003) *Netica - Application for Belief Networks and Influence Diagrams*, Available at:
663 <http://www.norsys.com/>.

664 Norton, L., Elliott, J.A., Maberly, S.C. and May, L. (2012a) Using models to bridge the gap between land use
665 and algal blooms: An example from the Loweswater catchment, UK, *Environmental Modelling and Software*
666 36: 64-75.

667 Norton, L.R., Inwood, H., Crowe, A. and Baker, A. (2012b) Trialling a method to quantify the 'cultural
668 services' of the English landscape using Countryside Survey data, *Land Use Policy* 29: 449-455.

669 Ojea, E., Martin-Ortega, J. and Chiabai, A. (2012) Defining and classifying ecosystem services for economic
670 valuation: the case of forest water services, *Environmental Science and Policy* 19-20: 1-15.

671 O'Riordan, T. and Stoll-Kleemann, S. (2002) *Biodiversity, Sustainability and Human Communities: Protecting*
672 *beyond the Protected*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

673 Pagiola, S., von Ritter, K. and Bishop, J.T. (2004) *Assessing the Economic Value of Ecosystem Conservation*,
674 TNC-IUCN-WB, Washington DC.

675 Pereira, H.M., Reyers, B., Watanabe, M., Bohensky, E., Foale, S., Palm, C. Espaldon, M.V., Armenteras, D.,
676 Tapia, M., Rinco'n, A., Lee, M.J., Patwardhan, A. and Gomes, I. (2005) Condition and trends of ecosystem
677 services and biodiversity, In: D. Capistrano, C. Samper, M. J. Lee, and C. Raudsepp-Hearne (Eds) *Ecosystems*
678 *and human well-being: multi scale assessments, Vol. 4. Findings of the Sub-global Assessments Working*
679 *Group of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment*, Island Press, Washington, D.C., USA.

680 Pollino, C.A., Woodberry, O., Nicholson, A., Korb, K. and Hart, B.T. (2007) Parameterisation and evaluation
681 of a Bayesian network for use in an ecological risk assessment, *Environmental Modelling and Software*
682 22: 1140-1152.

683 Ramajo-Hernández, J. and del Saz-Salazar, S. (2012) Estimating the non-market benefits of water quality
684 improvement for a case study in Spain: A contingent valuation approach, *Environmental Science and Policy*
685 22: 47-59.

686 Ramilan, T., Scrimgoeur, F. and Marsh, D. (2010) *Modelling riparian buffers for water quality enhancement*
687 *in the Karapiro catchment*, in: Australian Agricultural and Resource Economics Society 2010 Conference
688 (54th), 10-12 February 2010, Adelaide, Australia.

689 Rieman, B.E., Peterson, J.T., Clayton, J., Howell, P., Thurow, R., Thompson, W. and Lee, D.C. (2001)
690 Evaluation of potential effects of federal land management alternatives on trends of salmonids and their
691 habitats in the interior Columbia River basin, *Forest Ecology and Management* 153: 1–20.

692 Schaafsma, M., Brouwer, R., Rose, J. (2012) Directional heterogeneity in WTP models for environmental
693 valuation, *Ecological Economics* 79: 21-31.

694 Siameti, I. (2012) *Exploring the interaction of ecosystem processes and ecosystem services for effective*
695 *decision-making: A case study of sustainable flood management*, unpublished MSc thesis, University of
696 Edinburgh.

697 Soman, S., Beyler, S., Kraft, S., Thomas, D. and Winstanley, D. (2007) *Ecosystem Services from Riparian*
698 *Areas: A Brief Summary of the Literature*, Prepared for the Scientific Advisory Committee of the Illinois River
699 Coordinator Council.

700 Spence, P.L. and Jordan, S.J. (2013) Effects of nitrogen inputs on freshwater wetland ecosystem services – A
701 Bayesian network analysis, *Journal of Environmental Management* 124: 91-99.

702 Stutter, M.I., Chardon, W.J. and Kronvang, B. (2012) Riparian Buffer Strips as a Multifunctional
703 Management Tool in Agricultural landscapes: Introduction, *Journal of Environmental Quality* 41: 297-303.

704 Tabachi, E., Lambs, L., Guilloy, H., Planty-Tabachi, A., Muller, E. and Decamps, H. (2000) Impacts of riparian
705 vegetation on hydrological processes, *Hydrological Processes* 14: 2959-2976.

706 Tallis, H. and Kareiva, P. (2005) Ecosystem services, *Current Biology* 15 (18): 746–748.

707 Turner, R.K. and Daily, G.C. (2008) The ecosystem services framework and natural capital conservation,
708 *Environmental and Resource Economics* 39(1): 25-35.

709 Turner, R.K., Paavola, J., Cooper, P., Farber, S., Jessamy, V. and Georgiou, S. (2003) Valuing nature: lessons
710 learned and future research directions, *Ecological Economics* 46: 493–510.

711 UK NEA (2011) *UK National Ecosystem Assessment: understanding nature's value to society. Synthesis of key*
712 *findings*, Information Press 2011. Available at: [http://uknea.unep-](http://uknea.unep-wcmc.org/Resources/tabid/82/Default.aspx)
713 [wcmc.org/Resources/tabid/82/Default.aspx](http://uknea.unep-wcmc.org/Resources/tabid/82/Default.aspx)

714 Yu, J. and Belcher, K. (2011) An economic analysis of landowners' willingness to adopt wetland and riparian
715 conservation management, *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 59: 207-222.

716

Table 1 Description of BBN nodes and states

Type of node	Variable	Definition	States	Dependencies	Assumptions
Decision	Buffer strip	Type of buffer strip installed in riparian areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grassland • Natural vegetation • Mixed • No buffer strip 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grassland buffer strips are uncultivated where land cover is arable and ungrazed or uncut where land cover is grassland • Natural vegetation would involve planting of trees or shrubs (offering shading of water)
Parent	Region		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East England • West England 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic regions which are interacted with season, land cover, soil type and slope
	Land cover		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grassland • Arable • Natural vegetation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predominant type of land cover
	Seasons		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autumn • Winter • Spring • Summer 		
	Soil type		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandy (light) • Loamy (moderate) • Clay (heavy) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic soil type reflecting drainage characteristics
	Slope		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 		
Child	Riparian management	The vegetation type and level of coverage determined by the management intervention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grassland • Natural vegetation • No riparian management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buffer strips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This node allows buffer strips comprised of a mixture of grassland and natural vegetation
	Rainfall		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Region • Seasons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West England is assumed to have higher rainfall rates than East England.
	Vegetation coverage	The proportion of ground surface covered by vegetation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land cover • Seasons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grassland: grows all over the year with the highest density during spring/summer (i.e. is not much affected by seasonal changes) • Arable land: has the highest density during summer, does not grow during autumn • Natural vegetation: has the highest density during spring/summer, moderate density during autumn, the lowest density during winter
	Infiltration capacity	The ability of soil and plants to absorb water.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil type • Vegetation coverage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The greater the vegetation coverage, the higher the infiltration capacity will be. • Sand has high water permeability, while clay is more resistant to water infiltration.
	Overland flow	Water that flows across the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rainfall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The higher the rainfall rate, the lower the infiltration capacity and the

	land after rainfall. It does not include the water volume intercepted by vegetation or infiltrated by soil and plants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infiltration capacity • Slope 	<p>steeper the slope, then the higher the overland flow will be and vice versa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to minimise the number of nodes, evapotranspiration and volume of groundwater were regarded to contribute less to overland flow volume and were not included in the system.
Soil erosion rate	The rate of soil erosion.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil type • Vegetation coverage • Overland flow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clay is less erodible than sand. • Overland flow is assumed to have a greater impact (i.e. low overland flow will result in low erosion rate regardless of the soil type and vegetation coverage).
Sedimentation load	The amount of sediments that reach water bodies (i.e. eroded soil particles that are not trapped by riparian vegetation).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil erosion rate • Riparian management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grass covered surfaces facilitate greater rates of sediment deposition due to their high root density. • Sediment load is likely to be higher when no riparian management is applied.
Water nutrient concentration	The amount of nutrient content in stream water. Increased levels of nutrients in water bodies can cause water quality problems such as excessive plant growth rates (e.g. algae blooms) and eutrophication (Hime et al., 2009).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use • Sedimentation load 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arable land is assumed to result always in high water nutrient concentration due to use of fertilizers. • The greater the sedimentation load, then the higher the water nutrient concentration will be (because sediments transport substances such as plant and animal wastes, nutrients, pesticides, metals etc.). • Nutrient plant uptake is assumed to be fixed regardless of the land-use type. • Soil type effects are captured indirectly through erosion and sedimentation load.
Aquatic vegetation	The volume and density of vegetation growing into the water bodies. Aquatic vegetation is considered to have an effect on the velocity of river flow.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algae • Vascular plants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water nutrient concentration • Seasons 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under conditions of high nutrient concentration and high temperature (spring/summer), algae blooms will occur in water bodies (Borsuk et al., 2004). • The level of nutrients has been assumed to have a greater impact than temperature (i.e. despite high temperatures, algae will not bloom unless the water nutrient level is high).
Temperature	Water temperature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian management • Season 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural vegetation has a decreasing effect on temperature via shading.
Biological oxygen demand (BOD)	The amount of dissolved oxygen required by microorganisms (e.g. aerobic bacteria) in the oxidation of organic matter. In the scope of this study, BOD is used as an indicator of water quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower than 4 mg l⁻¹ • 4-6 mg l⁻¹ • 6-9 mg l⁻¹ • Higher than 9 mg l⁻¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquatic vegetation • Water nutrient concentration • Temperature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High temperatures and high level of water nutrient concentration result in algae blooms. This implies increased organic matter and thus higher level of BOD (i.e. the process of decomposition leads to oxygen depletion). • Characteristics such as the surrounding atmospheric pressure and the salinity of water regarded to contribute less to BOD and were not included in the model.
Water quality	Suitability of water for fishing, swimming, boating, or unsuitability for any use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue • Green • Yellow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BOD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each water quality category was converted into a BOD level, as following: • Blue = 0 - 4 mg l⁻¹,

		(Hime et al., 2009).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Red 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green = 4 - 6 mg^l⁻¹, • Yellow = 6-9 mg^l⁻¹, • Red = higher than 9 mg^l⁻¹
	Runoff rate	The rate of surface water that reaches water bodies (when soil is saturated and infiltration capacity is lower than the rainfall rate).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riparian management • Overland flow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural vegetation is assumed to be more effective than grassland in reducing runoff. • Overland flow is assumed to have a greater impact (i.e. low overland flow will result in low runoff rate regardless of the applied riparian management). • It is assumed that the runoff rate is always likely to be higher when riparian management is not applied.
	River flow	Volume of water flow in any given time period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Runoff rate • Rainfall • Aquatic vegetation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lower the runoff rate, rainfall rate and aquatic vegetation coverage, the lower the river flow will be. • Compared to algae, vascular plants are assumed to decrease more the velocity of river flow. Particular aquatic vegetation characteristics (e.g. height, rooting depth etc.) were not taken into consideration.
	Flood risk	Likelihood of a flood event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low • Medium • High 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River flow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk has been modelled as a deterministic variable. The higher the river flow, the higher the flood risk will be and vice versa.
Utility	Satisfaction	The utility that stakeholders will gain from the management intervention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous variable (scale 0-100) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood risk, • Water quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is assumed that the system objectives contribute equally to the output of the model (i.e. people will be totally satisfied only when both of the model objectives have been fully optimised).

Table 2 Conditional Probability Table (CPT) for the 'overland flow' node.

Infiltration capacity	State of parent nodes		Probability of overland flow outcome		
	Rainfall	Slope	Low	Medium	High
Low	Low	Low	0.6	0.3	0.1
Low	Low	Medium	0.6	0.3	0.1
Low	Low	High	0.6	0.3	0.1
Low	Medium	Low	0.3	0.6	0.1
Low	Medium	Medium	0.1	0.6	0.3
Low	Medium	High	0.1	0.3	0.6
Low	High	Low	0.1	0.3	0.6
Low	High	Medium	0.1	0.3	0.6
Low	High	High	0.1	0.3	0.6
Medium	Low	Low	0.6	0.3	0.1
Medium	Low	Medium	0.6	0.3	0.1
Medium	Low	High	0.6	0.3	0.1
Medium	Medium	Low	0.3	0.6	0.1
Medium	Medium	Medium	0.3	0.6	0.1
Medium	Medium	High	0.1	0.6	0.3
Medium	High	Low	0.1	0.6	0.3
Medium	High	Medium	0.1	0.3	0.6
Medium	High	High	0.1	0.3	0.6
High	Low	Low	0.6	0.3	0.1
High	Low	Medium	0.6	0.3	0.1
High	Low	High	0.6	0.3	0.1
High	Medium	Low	0.6	0.3	0.1
High	Medium	Medium	0.6	0.3	0.1
High	Medium	High	0.3	0.6	0.1
High	High	Low	0.3	0.6	0.1
High	High	Medium	0.3	0.6	0.1
High	High	High	0.1	0.6	0.3

Table 3 Conditional Probability Table (CPT) of the model utility node.

Flood risk	Water quality	Utility value
Low	Blue	100
Low	Green	100
Low	Yellow	75
Low	Red	50
Medium	Blue	65
Medium	Green	65
Medium	Yellow	50
Medium	Red	35
High	Blue	50
High	Green	50
High	Yellow	25
High	Red	0

Table 4 Characteristics of three scenarios examined in this study

Scenario	Region	Land cover	Soil type	Slope
A	East England	Arable land	Light free draining (sandy)	Low
B	West England	Grassland	Heavy poor draining (clay)	Medium
C	West England	Grassland	Heavy poor draining (clay)	High

Table 5 Utility values for the three scenarios

Scenario	Buffer strip management			
	Status quo	(% increase in utility relative to status quo)		
		Grassland	Natural vegetation	Mixed
A	55.39	56.71 (2.4%)	59.37 (7.2%)	58.04 (4.8%)
B	55.61	58.23 (4.7%)	59.91 (7.7%)	59.07 (6.2%)
C	54.53	57.42 (5.3%)	59.25 (8.7%)	58.33 (7.4%)

Table 6 Changes in the probability of outcomes under the optimal solution.

Scenario	Outcome	Status	Status quo (%)	Grassland (%)	Natural vegetation (%)	Mixed (%)	Change in prob. Status quo to optimal
A	Flood risk	Low	27.4	30.7	34.0	32.4	6.6
		Medium	49.0	47.4	47.3	47.4	-1.7
		High	23.6	21.9	18.6	20.3	-5.0
	Water quality	Blue	17.1	17.1	18.8	17.9	1.8
		Green	27.8	27.8	28.9	28.3	1.1
		Yellow	32.3	32.3	31.5	31.9	-0.8
	Red	22.8	22.8	20.9	21.8	-2.1	
B	Flood risk	Low	23.0	26.1	29.1	27.6	6.1
		Medium	46.7	46.7	47.7	47.2	1.0
		High	30.4	27.3	23.3	25.3	-7.1
	Water quality	Blue	22.5	24.4	25.2	24.8	2.7
		Green	31.8	33.1	32.2	32.7	0.5
		Yellow	28.4	26.9	27.0	27.0	-1.4
	Red	17.4	15.5	15.6	15.6	-1.8	
C	Flood risk	Low	21.3	24.5	27.7	26.1	6.4
		Medium	46.2	46.7	48.1	47.4	1.9
		High	32.5	28.7	24.2	26.5	-8.3
	Water quality	Blue	22.3	24.4	25.0	24.7	2.7
		Green	31.6	33.1	32.2	32.7	0.6
		Yellow	28.5	27.0	27.1	27.0	-1.4
	Red	17.6	15.5	15.7	15.6	-1.9	




Figure 1 Ecosystem service cascade (Adapted from Haines-Young and Potschin 2009)




Figure 2 Sequence of interdisciplinary workshops used for BBN development




Figure 3 BBN model (Scenario B) of riparian buffer strip management system




Figure 4 Expanded BBN incorporating socio-economic drivers of preferences