sDiv working group meeting report
"sILK"

1. Focal areas of discussion + main results/conclusions + open questions

The sILK workshop focused on two main areas of discussion and their integration. The first main area of discussion was relational values (RV). We spent the first day synthesizing the meaning of relational values as it is used and defined in the literature. We discussed through presentations, breakout groups and plenary discussion methods used for assessing RV in research and how RV may be mobilized in policy targeting the conservation of bio-cultural diversity. The second main focal area was Indigenous and Local Knowledge (ILK). We had presentation from the group describing current understanding and usage of ILK in the literature and special considerations for research engaging with Indigenous cultures, knowledge systems and worlds views. We had multiple breakout session and subsequent plenary discussion about how ILK may inform RV research and if context specific RV found in ILK context could illuminate "portable" modes of interacting with non-human nature that support more just and sustainable futures.

2. Content of presentations

Each sILK participant had an opportunity to give a 5-10-minute presentation organized in flash panels based on issues statements the wrote prior to the meeting. They then address questions from the other panelists and from the audience. We also invited some participants, who are acknowledged expert on a topic, to give brief overview presentations on the state of the art of RV research and ILK research. The project PIs (Austin Himes and Barbara Muraca) also gave a presentation for the iDiv seminar titled, "Towards a relational turn in biodiversity and ecosystem services."

3. General research ideas, questions & directions discussed (incl. potential data to be used etc.)

We began the week with three possible outcomes for the project:

1. Developing a comprehensive and critical assessment of strengths, opportunities, challenges, and knowledge gaps regarding operationalization of RV for environmental governance and management informed by ILK worldviews and practices
2. Bringing together diverse expertise from relational values, environmental governance, and ILK research and cross-fertilize between different approaches that operate otherwise independently
3. Develop guidance criteria for the horizontal portability of successful models of local environmental governance that are rooted in a specific socio-natural context to other contexts.

In working toward these three outcomes, we completed a draft outline for a paper manuscript aiming at developing a conceptual framework for a 5 steps pathway for RV research committed to collaboration with and integration across Indigenous and Local Knowledge systems; key elements of the framework are community-based expertise, engaged work applied concretely to valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services with a focus on place-specific relational values and their portability to other contexts.

We also developed a list of ideas for other publications to be further developed through collaborations within the group which included:

1. Multimedia project with narrative descriptions of different RVs and how they support (or don't) biodiversity conservation and sustainability.
2. Short academic paper describing participatory methods for communication on RV based on a small group brainstorming exercise piloted during the meeting.
3. Further develop research and collaborate on a paper about how RV can be used as a tool toward transformative action.
4. Review of "bright spots in policy" where policies and praxis that engage with RV have offered the potential for more just and sustainable outcomes.
5. Further explore and potentially develop a manuscript focused on the concept and implications of "non-substitutability," a core component of RV.
6. Further explore and develop a manuscript on the synergies, risks and limitation of RV research with Indigenous communities.
7. A collaborative brochure or website written in collaboration with Indigenous and Local partner about the opportunities of RV research and applications for practitioners

4. General structure of the week (break out groups, presentations, sessions with remote participants etc.)

Each day we started with an ice-breaker aimed at building community, getting to know each other, and having some general exchange on the topics in a fun way. Plenary sessions were hybrid with at least one participant joining online throughout the whole workshops.

1. The first day, after time dedicated to collecting expectations and presenting the frame of the workshop, consisted mostly of plenary sessions with flash panel presentations and discussions.
2. The second day was dedicated to bring all participants up to speed with respect to the two core topics of the project, we had two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon focused on RV and ILK respectively. Each session encompasses an introductory plenary presentation and discussion followed by break-out groups.
3. The third day had reporting from break out groups to the plenary and a short period of small groups discussing cases studies and data from the participants' research. The afternoon of the third day included the iDiv seminar and free time with optional social activities.

5. Next steps & upcoming deliverables

The next step is to draft a manuscript of the framework paper we outlined at the workshop. We expect to have a complete draft in December. Subgroups will also work on other outcome papers and other products in parallel.

6. General working atmosphere and feedback on sDiv support (What kind of support? How helpful was it?)

The general working atmosphere was very welcoming and vibrant. Everyone was very committed to the topic and interested in the collaboration. As a point of critique, during the final evaluation, participants expressed their preference for shorter plenary sessions and more work in smaller groups. They were very appreciative of the welcoming environment both on the side of the host (iDiv) and of the other participants and impressed by the stimulating discussion and the possibility of continuing the collaboration. Everyone participated actively not only with respect to the contents, but also to making the collaboration easy and friendly (for example, by supporting the hybrid participation of virtual participants also during all breakout groups).