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1. Introduction

“Programmes and technologies of government... are assemblages which may have a rationality, but this is not one of a coherence of origin or singular essence...To analyse... is not to seek for a hidden unity beyond this complex diversity...It is to reveal the historicity and the contingency of the truths that have come to define the limits of our contemporary ways of understanding...” (Rose 1999, p276-77)

This paper engages with the on-going emergence of Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) in Wales (UK) over the last ten years, unravelling how it has permeated through policy discourse and been advocated in different place-based contexts. My aims in setting out this narrative are twofold. Firstly, the paper engages with the increasing consensus around the emergent complexity and inherent hybridity of PES as a governance programme1. Second, the paper considers how such diversity pushes us to rework the framing of PES as hegemonic discourse that acts upon people in place.

Echoing previous understandings of globalisation and neoliberalisation, the conception of (P)ES is often seen to come from ‘elsewhere’. It is associated with elites, in both policy and capital terms, and portrayed as a homogenising and ordering force which attempts to rewrite complex socio-ecological assemblages (Sullivan 2013). Clearly, the production and mobilisation of PES is connected to the circuits and dynamics of neoliberalisation (Arsel and Büscher 2012; Brockington and Duffy 2010; Robertson 2012). Yet, just as studies of neoliberalisation have shown (Peck 2013), this is not an uncontested or a one-way process.

The acknowledgement of PES as a hybrid formulation, refigured through varying contextual factors, reminds us that place matters. It is equally clear that people matter. Whilst understanding the role of ‘global actors’ and agencies is critical, the appropriation and utilisation of these concepts and terminology by a diverse array of people is equally relevant. As I have argued elsewhere (Wynne-Jones 2012), intermediary actors play a particularly interesting role. Similarly, understanding the processes through which PES is seen to work with, appeal to, and nurture particular subjectivities, is integral to understanding how these governmentalities work. Moreover, it is important to explore, rather than write-out, the diversity and contingency evident in our analyses of such policy programmes (Rose 1999).

By tracing the development of PES within Wales, this paper allows us to reflect upon the role and motivations of individuals and groupings involved, and tie this to the ways in which they

1 i.e. it is evident as neither a pure market nor command-and-control approach.
are constructing and translating PES into a mobile and malleable project of governance. In empirical terms, this paper moves forward from previous papers (Wynne-Jones 2012, 2013a), to include analysis of developments that have occurred since 2010 and connects the State and wider formations that have otherwise been discussed in isolation².

2. UK Policy Background

Before we can engage with the situation in Wales, it is helpful to present a brief overview of the wider UK policy context to demonstrate points of connection and information flow³.

Across the whole of the UK there has been an upsurge in interest in PES since the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA 2005). This then fed into a further international report on ‘The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity’ (TEEB 2010)⁴. Within the UK, the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee recommended (in 2007) that a UK National Ecosystem Assessment should be conducted (UKNEA 2011) and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) set up an ecosystems research programme.

In 2013, the second phase of the UKNEA is now underway⁵. This programme has been supported by a range of similarly aligned research initiatives including the Valuing Nature Network (VNN)⁶ and Defra’s Ecosystem Knowledge Network⁷. Working in partnership with the VNN scientists in many instances, Defra’s research has centred on investigating the practicalities of translating the ecosystems concept into a usable tool. One of the key mechanisms utilised was the development of three pilot projects focusing on catchment management in the UK’s uplands (Waters et al. 2012)⁸. These early pilots have now been expanded with a further ten projects being supported⁹.

A key point to note here is the focus upon catchments and upland management, which is also evident in Wales. Equally, the emphasis upon ‘pilot projects’ and place-based experimentation demonstrates a shift away from the earlier focus on large national and international data sets, often achieved through ‘secluded’ approaches to research (Callon et al. 2009) and value-transfer. In contrast, the current phase of development in both ecosystem

---

² It should be noted that during this period (since 2010) I have worked closely with civil servants in the policy divisions associated with agricultural, environmental and rural policy as part of my role conducting research for the Wales Rural Observatory. This has enabled access to a number of internal documents and permitted both formal interviews and informal conversations, which have provided ethnographic data on the policy development process.

³ Wales has been partially devolved from the UK since 1999. The UK’s Westminster Government still has control over taxation, defence and energy policy, although the process of devolution is on-going. In other policy areas there are still similarities and information sharing.

⁴ This was commissioned at the G8 meeting in Potsdam in 2007 and led by the United Nations Environment Programme.

⁵ This aims to further develop and communicate the evidence base and make it relevant to decision and policy making at different spatial scales.

⁶ http://www.valuing-nature.net/ [last access 6/11/13].

⁷ http://ekn.defra.gov.uk [last access 6/11/13].

⁸ Here partnerships were set up to trial the ‘Delivering Nature’s Services Programme’ as a means to: take a more holistic approach to considering what we want the uplands provide; demonstrate that investment in the natural environment can result in multiple benefits; and deliver a range of ecosystem services in a cost effective way and link these services to beneficiaries.

⁹ These include additional catchment-based research, such as the trials of a reverse-auction on the Fowey Catchment in Cornwall; ‘place based’ approaches in uplands areas; and the development of a UK Peatland Carbon Code to give business the confidence to invest in the restoration and protection of damaged peatlands.
service (ES) science and valuation methodology demonstrates a greater willingness to engage with publics and deliberative processes. It also suggests that the questions being addressed, in the current phase of work, cannot (and should not) be answered in isolation from the practise of life (Latour 2011).

A further development that has worked alongside these scientific studies is the ‘independent business-led’ Ecosystem Market Taskforce¹⁰, who have identified the following priorities (EMFT 2013):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Biodiversity offsetting</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Bio-energy and anaerobic digestion on farms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustainable Local Woodfuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nature-based certification &amp; labelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Water cycle catchment management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These have been confirmed by the UK Government, along with the following actions (Defra 2013).

- The launch of a pilot UK peatland carbon code
- Post PR14 (pricing review) discussions with water companies, Environment Agency and the regulator (OFWAT) on very long term planning for water management.
- A Government and business-led roadmap to support the integration of natural capital¹¹ in business accounting and business reporting (under the Companies Act).

3. Developing PES in Wales

Within Wales, these wider UK policy and research programmes have been influential, with many civil servants and academics operating across both contexts. Similarly, the ways in which NGO actors have instigated and negotiated PES in Wales has been affected by their professional interactions at a UK level. But due to the partially devolved nature of the Welsh Government, and differences in geography that have prompted particular political priorities, there are a number of divergences.

3.1 Policy Framing

Broadly speaking there are many resonances between the UK’s Natural Environment White Paper and the Welsh Natural Environment Framework (NEF), in the emphasis upon an ‘ecosystems approach’, consideration of ‘ecosystem services’, and reference to themes of ecological connectivity and resilience that arose in the Lawton report (2010). However, the NEF was published a year earlier (in 2010), and Welsh civil servants have been keen to make distinctions. In particular, the restructuring of the Welsh environment sector into a unified body ‘Natural Resources Wales’¹² has been set-out as an important feature, offering a tailormade vehicle through which the ecosystems approach can be effectively orchestrated¹³.

¹⁰ This was a key commitment of the UK’s 2011 Natural Environment White Paper, and asked to report back (in March 2013) to the UK Government’s Green Economy Council. They have also been supported by a VNN research package (Duke et al. 2012).
¹² Previously the environment sector was composed of three distinct bodies – the Forestry Commission, Environment Agency and Countryside Council – which have now been rationalised. They are a government
Through the early policy material associated with these developments, references to ‘an ecosystem approach’ were more prevalent than discussion of services or marketised regulatory methods. For example:

“[the ecosystems] approach will require holistic management, integrated regulatory approaches, management on a spatial scale and partnership working.”

(National Assembly for Wales: Environment and Sustainability Committee 2013, p5)

In addition, the Minister’s remit letter to Natural Resources Wales (in March 2013) discusses their role in terms of furthering “the ecosystems approach”. Nevertheless, interest in the opportunities for new markets is apparent, with explicit reference to these in the Minister’s (4\textsuperscript{th} June 2012)\textsuperscript{14} response to the State of Nature Report:

“our future Environment Bill provide a platform to deliver… new ways of managing land and water that provide multiple benefits and generate new markets and income from environmental services.”

Beyond this policy rhetoric, there are two distinct forums in which PES have been developed which I will now consider in turn: first through agri-environment policy and then as an integrated approach to rural-development in upland areas. As I will go onto outline, there are a number of inter-linkages and repercussions from the varying successes and failures experienced in both cases.

3.2 From Agri-Environment Schemes to PES?

Prior to the publication of the Environment Framework the ES discourse was being mobilised in Wales through the development of a new agri-environment scheme (AES), Glastir; starting in 2008\textsuperscript{15}. In Wales, schemes operating as part the Wales Rural Development Plan, and broader EU Common Agricultural Policy, have been adapted – at least notionally - to offer PES to farmers. The initial discursive shift was marked, with the introduction of a distinct market lexicon and expanded remit to focus on a range of ES previously unaddressed, including carbon sequestration and water management. However, the resultant scheme was much less removed from previous iterations than earlier indications might have suggested. Glastir has much in common with wider UK and EU schemes which offer ‘action’ rather than ‘outcome’ based payments; and the government is also continuing to operate as an intermediary between disparate public beneficiaries and private land managers who provide ES. Nevertheless, the policy debates and discursive framings which have surrounded the development of Glastir show a clear deference to neoliberal imperatives.

As I have outlined elsewhere (Wynne-Jones 2013a), the reasons behind this fraught advance of PES are multi-faceted, with personality politics coming into play as much as international

\textsuperscript{13} This move has also been critiqued for worrying undertones of being a merger undertaken for economic reasons.

\textsuperscript{14} Alun Davies, (Minister for Natural Resources and Food), The Pollinator Action Plan and response to the State of Nature Report, (Oral Statement), 4 June 2012.

\textsuperscript{15} No such changes have occurred with the UK’s AES, although research into the instigation of a more results orientated (Payment-by-Results) form of AES has taken place at a UK level (Schwarz et al. 2008).
negotiations around the legitimacy of farm subsidies. One of the unifying themes observed is the widespread support for moving beyond the current income-foregone basis of AES payments. This imperative is clearly evident in the WG committee minutes and supporting consultation documentation associated with Glastir. It has also been recorded in wider Welsh rural policy forums.

However, at least for the moment, the restriction of EC regulation 1698/2005 (on the basis of AES payments) has prevented the Welsh Government from adopting an incentive approach, paying for the value of goods and services. Whilst it is clear that other countries have begun to experiment within the confines of the regulations (Burton and Schwarz 2013; Wynne-Jones et al. 2013), discussions with civil servants within WG indicate that they do not feel able to do this and are being cautious about what they are allowed to do in the eyes of the European Commission.

In light of this seeming impasse, there is little expectation of AES becoming PES in the immediate future (LNFN 17 Rep’ pers. comm. October 2013). Rather, AES are now envisaged to work as part of a broader ecosystems approach alongside other measures which will incorporate private payment mechanisms. Paving the way for this blended approach, the Minister for Natural Resources and Food made an announcement at the Royal Welsh Show (in July 2013) that private money may be now sought to supplement AES funding for the delivery of ES:

“I have asked my officials to explore the opportunities to expand out budgets with commercial funding, to find ways to incentive the delivery of ecosystem services... where possible I wish to move away from simply paying the offset of lost agricultural production and costs incurred” (Alun Davies, 23rd July 2013).18

Defending this move, the Minister outlined that this is not only due to EC restrictions, but equally to make-up for shortfalls in public-finance as the EU budget tightens. Here it is important to appreciate the broader context of CAP Reform which has had a marked impact upon PES development in Wales:

“Going forward, we know we need less reliance on subsidy payments and more focus on business and profitability.” (Alun Davies: 23 May 2013)19

“The Welsh Government is considering all possible funding streams for developing a more sustainable and robust land management. At a time of budgetary constraint the WG is keen to explore the possibilities of attracting private funding to buy ecosystems services provided by land from the landowners.” (WG 2013a)

Similarly, it is notable that in internal government communications, detailing WG’s current listing of PES projects in Wales, one of the key criteria noted is “potential to be self-

---

16 i.e. compensating farmers for the value of agricultural production lost as a consequence of engaging with environmental management.

17 WG’s Land, Nature, Forestry and Marine Division


19 Statement from WG’s Annual Farming Conference; reported through WG’s online news article ‘Industry and government plan for a healthy future for farming in Wales’: http://wales.gov.uk/newsroom/environmentandcountryside/2013/130523plan/?lang=en [last accessed 6/11/13].
sustaining without government intervention” (ibid). As such, it is evident that a major driver for the Welsh Government has been to prepare the farming sector for a future of decreasing public monies, and as such re-shaping the dominant image of farmers.20

3.3 Asserting the Role of Pilot Projects

Unsurprisingly this rather negative portrayal of farmers has met with hostility and not helped difficulties already emerging with the Glastir scheme. These concerns with Glastir are not actually connected to the introduction of the (P)ES discourse per say, but lie with a poor rate of payment, balanced against high levels of prescription and a weak communications strategy (WRO 2012). However, as a result of poor scheme uptake, the Minister has now been able to allocate a surplus of £6 million (which was underspent from Glastir) to support pilot projects for ‘Ecosystem Resilience and Diversity’.

Exploring the framing of these pilots, it is notable that ecological connectivity and resilience continue to appear alongside the language of goods and service provision (WG 2013b). Moreover, they are clearly aimed to deliver on existing targets for biodiversity, water management and the Welsh Government’s constitutional commitment to Sustainable Development – highlighting key parameters within which PES must work.

In instigating these pilots, WG aims to promote partnership amongst a range of organisations from private, third and public sectors. This is as a means to nurture new relationships which might not otherwise have been explored, but could offer a more integrated approach to ecosystem management (WG 2013b). Reflecting upon existing pilots collated by WG (2013a), diverse consortiums are evident. Nevertheless, it is also clear that WG is keen to maintain a steering role, with resources allocated to cover the staffing and administration costs required to catalogue and facilitate these projects. Moreover, whilst existing projects are positioned as being independent from government, many of the actors involved are closely linked with government and/or recognised as part of an ‘elite project class’ (cf. Woods et al. 2007).

Going forward, it is apparent that place-based pilots are the central vehicle through which PES are now being mobilised here. However, despite clear aspirations to involve private partners and develop market approaches, a number of hurdles have been evident which have affected the course PES is taking in Wales, challenging the expectations and desires of key agents.

3.4 Attempts to Involve the Private Sector in Upland Areas

Specifically, there has been a clear push to use PES as a tool for upland management combining the objectives of environmental governance with a means to supplant ineffectual rural development strategies in these areas (see e.g. CMI 2013; LUC 2008, 2013). However, these aims have not been easy to realise. In particular, it is helpful to reflect upon the

---

20 This has been complicated and stalled by differences in Ministerial opinion, with the previous Minister showing much stronger alignment with the farming community as I outlined in Wynne-Jones (2013a). Understanding her role in the advance of Glastir demonstrates many of the peculiarities of government, with claims that she agreed to Glastir as part of a compromise on strategies to address other fraught issues within the farming community.
experiences of two major projects\textsuperscript{21} which have been the focus of longstanding government and NGO commitment.

Whilst recent survey work has demonstrated a willingness to develop PES (LUC 2013), it is evident that connecting beneficiaries and providers is far from straight-forward. Many farmers have limited confidence in the potential of PES (Wynne-Jones 2013b) and, to date, private investors have been reluctant to engage. Specifically, difficulties have been reported in securing investment for management to deliver flood mitigation and water quality. This is despite a very proactive stance including media coverage, publicity of supporting scientific evidence, and tailored marketing campaigns (see figure 1):

![Image](https://example.com/image.png)

**Figure 1:** The cover of the Wildlife Trust’s Investment Brochure for The Pumlumon Project\textsuperscript{22}

To elaborate, it was hoped that investment from insurance brokers would provide a suitable source of financing for upland management practises to mitigate downstream flooding. However, discussions with policy staff at the Association of British Insurers (ABI) in 2011 found that there was a perceived lack of consensus about the efficacy of such an approach to flood mitigation (Hughes et al. 2011). Moreover, the highly competitive and spatially unsegregated nature of the insurance industry meant that there was no financial incentive for individual insurance companies to fund catchment management schemes. Discussing these issues with senior civil servants in 2013, it appears that the same issues remain (LNFN Rep’ pers. comm. October 2013), although there is some potential to garner interest from companies with clearer Welsh links\textsuperscript{23}.

Turning to the potential of attaining payments for water quality, this is often hailed as one of the most important avenues through which PES are being advanced elsewhere in the UK. One of the reasons why these schemes have been championed is the perceived simplicity of attaching a value to land management, as the cost-avoided of down-stream treatment enables an easy calculation for the water companies involved. In addition, these mechanisms have been granted increasing levels of support by the regulatory body OFWAT, which has permitted a levy to be placed on water bills as a means to fund catchment management.

\textsuperscript{21} The Cambrian Mountain’s Initiative: \url{http://cambrianmountains.co.uk/} and Pumlumon Project: \url{http://www.montwt.co.uk/pumlumon.html} [last accessed 6/11/13].
\textsuperscript{22} \url{http://www.montwt.co.uk/images/user/Pum_brochure.pdf} [last accessed 6/11/13].
\textsuperscript{23} In addition, it is notable that the Pumlumon Project has been able to source funding from Insurance Companies, but not in the form of a direct payment for services (MWT 2010).
Looking to the future, as part of its current price review (PR14) OFWAT is considering the options for creating markets for water that better capture its full range of social and environmental benefits – an approach it refers to as ‘stimulating upstream markets’.

However, despite this permissive regulatory environment and a growing evidence base, Dwr Cymru (Welsh Water) have been unwilling to participate in the upland regions. Their reasoning varies from arguments that the water here is cleaner, and so there is no demand as yet, through to restrictions associated with their not-for-profit status which is considered to affect their ability to allocate funding for this type of investment (LNFN Rep’ pers. comm. October 2013). In addition, the current standard for agreements with farmers is 5 years, which it is argued would not constitute a good investment for the customer. Instead, it was outlined that 20-100 year agreements are required, but this would be problematic from the perspective of land managers who are nervous about long term changes to their practise and the stability of the ES agenda into the future (Wynne-Jones 2013b).

In marked contrast with these failures in the uplands, in lowland areas Dwr Cymru has entered into partnerships with farmers concerned about nutrient enrichment and sediment run-off from catchments that are dominated by intensive dairying. As a consequence, WG now appears to be re-thinking its stance on PES promotion, realising that their original ambitions may not be realisable in the immediate future.

4. Discussion

Within Wales the development and mobilisation of (P)ES has involved a range of non-government actors, who have played a critical role in the early advancement and translation of PES (Wynne-Jones 2012). Yet it is particularly evident as a project orchestrated by actors within central government. Private sector involvement here has been limited to date.

Developments here can usefully be viewed through the frame of governmentality, where-in actions have been taken forward to demarcate new forms of control, to reshape objects, ways of knowing them, and the modes of subjectivity and citizenship associated. Yet, it is also clear that PES is not the result of a singular ‘problematique’ (see Rose 1999). Rather, it is an approach that has been mapped onto, and translated through, pre-existing governance programmes. There-in it has aligned with various aims: to address EU drivers on the Water Framework and Habitats Directives, Common Agricultural Policy Reform and wider restructuring of the EU’s Common Strategic Framework. International pressures for climatic (carbon) governance are equally evident. In addition, domestic concerns have been identified in the form of rural development failures; the need to optimise processes for land-use planning; the implication of public spending cuts; and the troublesome subject of the subsidy dependent farmer.

While there is evidence of archetypally neoliberal thinking in many of the approaches outlined, the narrative presented demonstrates that this is not a singular position, starting

---

24 Here farmers have been financially supported to develop nutrient management plans to improve the run-off from the catchment as a means to reduce their own operating costs and avoid the designation of the catchment as a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. In both cases the farmers have come together as a producer grouping or co-operative to negotiate with other interested stakeholders to achieve solutions in all parties’ interests. It is notable that the farmers here are changing their management for their own benefits, as well as those of the water company, and as such the notion of PES does not fit neatly. But it is evident that partners including Dwr Cymru are prepared to invest (if only indirectly) to secure clean water supply.
from a discrete set of motivations. Nevertheless, it is apparent that various rationales are being streamlined into an ostensibly unified agenda through the production and performativity of (P)ES. However, observing the oscillations and reformulation of these governance programmes presents a narrative that is impossible to frame as a coherent and strategic vision heading towards an optimal end-point. Whilst the omnipresence of (P)ES (as a discursive frame) across a range of networks and programmes can obscure this untidy journey, it is important to appreciate the infiltration of (P)ES in more opportunistic and ad-hoc terms. This returns us to the imperative, outlined in the introduction, to reveal the historicity and contingency of governance regimes (Rose 1999).

At the most basic level, it is clear that different individuals (including both Ministers and staff within the civil service) have been involved at different stages in the processes described, with very different personal and political agendas adding new ingredients to the mix. In addition, it is important to note the effect of reactionary events and unexpected openings. For example, the farming community’s disengagement with Glastir, which has led to a reaffirmation of perceptions of subsidy dependence, but also enabled the provision of new funding sources to pilot ‘independent’ PES schemes. The incidence of challenges, and the ways they have subsequently been addressed, is also particularly notable in terms of the difficulties experienced attracting the private sector.

In addition to the shift in geographic focus outlined, these difficulties have reaffirmed the importance of research work to demarcate and quantify stocks and flows of ES, but also spurred pressures for standardised frameworks for investment (such as the UK’s Peatland Code). Nevertheless, idiosyncratic problems continue to occur, and assumptions of universal transferability (both of ES information and decision-making processes) are not seen to bear out. This has led to an increasing emphasis, from all parties, upon the role of place-based experiments and resulted in an array of non-standard collaborations between actors representing a range of interests and sectors, which show many overlaps with the mode of ‘governing by experiment’ outlined by Bulkeley and Broto (2013).

Amidst this confusing kaleidoscope of iterations, (P)ES in Wales demonstrates a continued ambition of the Welsh Government to govern, by which I mean to effectively administer and orchestrate management. Even when non-government actors are present, their role has been accounted for and in some instances even allocated or mobilised by government actors. By some way of explanation, it is important to note that the Welsh Government is still in the process of devolving, and their ambition to govern the country they have only recently gained a political remit for is strongly felt. They are equally keen to mark-out their approach from England, but also to be ambitious and show leadership, with their early adoption of an ecosystems approach and somewhat premature instigation of the Glastir scheme showing evidence of this. Overall, we can see the development of PES here as an explicit and calculated programme of intervention, but “not the produce of singular intention or will” (Murray-Li 2007, 6).

To conclude, I wish to raise a question connected to the challenges of engaging with such complexity. Whilst we (as critical scholars) have responded by adding greater layers of sophistication to our analyses, there is still a strong sense that current forms of hybridity are only a temporary settlement, and the ultimate aim of PES advocates is to achieve the operation of a pure market. In addition, responses to hybridisation and contextual variation have often been framed as a way to demonstrate that ‘pure’ markets don’t – and will never – work. Here I want to question whether such an impetus is too simplistic.
Connecting the narrative here with a wider evidence base, it is important to note multiple points of disagreement even amongst advocates of (P)ES (Dempsey and Robertson 2012). The options for developing PES are discussed in increasingly loose terms, with less accord necessitated with pure market function (e.g. Duke et al. 2012; Dunn 2011). In the applied literature, the need for local specification, responsiveness and adaptation has increasingly been discussed, with a strong emphasis upon the formative role of institutional and legislative contexts (e.g. Nahlik et al. 2012; Muradian et al. 2010). This prompts us to question: if advocates are now beginning to acknowledge limitations in their original objectives, should we as critics not also start to move forward from that understanding? If PES development is not travelling towards the imagined end-point of full-marketization, do we need to rethink our engagements?
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