

Questions to trigger transformative thinking for springing out of the traps

What are Traps? ✓

From our analysis across all the case studies, we identified four patterns of interconnected barriers to nature-based solutions mainstreaming that are recognized in all case studies.

TRAP 01

Weak(ening) Evidence

Represents how risk aversion of regional and local governments' practice is reinforced by limited epistemological inclusivity, and a weak evidence basis for drawing climate policy and planning measures that results in slow or stalled policy implementation.

What questions should we ask in order to spring out of the trap? ✓

Identified questions that explicate how to exit or spring out of the trap.

- How can policies bring in diverse and sustainable funding for long-term adaptive planning?
- What is a safe and approachable way for a new pilot or NbS project to tackle risk aversion through experimentation?
- How can data management and evaluation plans to connect more policies, stakeholders, and nearby NbS to a region?

Exiting Trap 1:

Adaptive, flexible, and interconnected regional-wide efforts

TRAP 02

Community as a challenge

Refers to the situation where there is an avoidance of public officers engaging with communities and citizens that reinforces a lack of participatory planning and preference for consultations, which fuels distrust of public institutions from local communities and a transactional attitude toward engagement and participation from the communities.

- How can existing community efforts be captured, honored, published and disseminated to a wider audience (to both strengthen the practice and serve as evidence for future funding)?
- How can community participation and co-creation be piloted, measured, and eventually embedded in NbS policy?
- How can the NbS maintain accessibility and participation for local communities?

Exiting Trap 2:

Community as ally, collaborator and innovator

TRAP 03

Excluding Narratives of Climate Change and Nature-based Solutions

Refers to the ways Nature-based Solutions have been advocated and/or communicated alongside climate change action create excluding narratives, with technocratic language/terms that disengages community and blocks buy-in.

- How can your NbS pilot, site, policy move beyond using stakeholder and scientific language, and engage in different types of information dissemination and meaning-making?
- How can your NbS site maintain NbS as a place for solutions that aren't just technical but also social and engaging to the public?

Exiting Trap 3:

Pluriform and meaningful narratives

TRAP 04

Ambivalence in place - Nature-based solutions as simultaneously soft and hard solutions

This trap captures the portrayal of nature-based solutions as "soft" (desirable and easy to advocate for) and "hard" (technocratic and difficult to communicate about) simultaneously that creates a stalemate in how they are translated across urban agendas, especially those on urban regeneration/planning.

- How can your region or site focus on NbS as a place where nature can be reintroduced to people not as a "natural" or "technical" element, but as a dynamic design (i.e. some ponds smell bad, but so does trash, therefore nature is not bad or worse than the already existing smells in the city)?
- How can your region & demo site maintain the NbS through seasonal changes, disasters, or stressors while continuing to engage communities (i.e. the smell of the pond is not the issue)?
- During the more technical implementation of the NbS, how can communities be prepared for changes (i.e., high traffic in the city during a green corridor construction)?
- How are specific trade-offs (smell and increase in mosquitoes) delivered and understood by the population?
- Which stakeholders can be involved to help buffer trade-offs (public health can create warnings about mosquitos, transportation officers create a new bus route during construction for local residents)?

Exiting Trap 4:

Embracing and transforming relations with place and nature