



CREATING LEVERAGE TO ENHANCE BIODIVERSITY OUTCOMES
OF GLOBAL BIOMASS TRADE



Stakeholder Engagement in CLEVER

Deliverable 8.5

Approaches to and Insights from Stakeholder
Engagement at the End of the First Year of the Project

Summary

Work Package	8
Deliverable N°	8.5
Dissemination Level	Public
Type	Report
Lead Partner	UNEP-WCMC
Due Date	31 st August 2023
Submission Date	31 st August 2023
Status	Final
Authors	Juan Manuel Vargas, Heli Sihvonen, Sharon Brooks and Lisen Runsten UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre, United Kingdom.

About CLEVER

Project Number	101060765
Project Title	CLEVER: Creating Leverage to Enhance Biodiversity Outcomes of Global Biomass Trade
Topic	HORIZON-CL6-2021-BIODIV-01-15
Start date	1 st September 2022
End date	31 st August 2025
Coordinator	RHEINISCHE FRIEDRICH-WILHELMS-UNIVERSITAT BONN

This document has been prepared in the framework of the project CLEVER. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



This project has received funding from the European Research Executive Agency under HORIZON Research and Innovation Actions, grant agreement n°101060765

Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Introduction	2
3. Approaches to Stakeholder Engagement: Co-design with Scope	2
3.1. Purpose and Objectives	2
3.2. Stakeholder Reference Group: Desired Outcomes.....	3
3.3. The Role of Co-design in CLEVER	6
3.4. Engagement and Co-design Set Up.....	7
4. Insights from the Stakeholder Engagement Activities	9
4.1. Co-designing a Conceptual Framework	9
4.2. Analysis of the Conceptual Framework	11
4.3. Additional Contributions	13
5. Conclusions	14

1. Executive Summary

This report presents CLEVER's approach to stakeholder engagement and co-design. The project sets up a Stakeholder Reference Group (SRF) comprising representatives from the policy sector, business, certification, and civil society initiatives. The SRF helps refine assumptions, hypotheses, and modelling scenarios, ensuring relevance, credibility, and legitimacy of the outcomes. Stakeholders also serve as key informants for empirical research and contribute to the generation of innovative policy recommendations.

The main objectives of stakeholder engagement in CLEVER are to enable diverse stakeholders to refine the research questions, to facilitate knowledge transfer and uptake, and to provide an opportunity to participate in the co-design process for innovative policy recommendations and governance instruments. Co-design is central to achieving transformative change as it involves developing solutions with end-users and target groups, resulting in innovative and validated outcomes relevant to stakeholders and decision-makers. The co-design process in CLEVER is implemented through scheduled hybrid and in-person interviews and workshops, with the SRF forming the core group, supplemented by other identified actors from stakeholder mapping.

Insights from stakeholder engagement in the creation of a conceptual framework for the project reveal the importance of understanding the timing and location of trade impacts on biodiversity, the drivers of biodiversity loss, effective conservation practices, and multi-actor negotiation processes. Additionally, a gap analysis of stakeholder group participation reveals actors that should be encouraged to take part in the project to enable representation of diverse and cross-sectorial voices.

2. Introduction

CLEVER is a research project that aims to inform EU-level policymaking around global trade by providing scientifically informed recommendations to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes. For a program that seeks to bring about change, successful stakeholder engagement must foster sustainable and long-lasting collaboration across the sectors that enable transformational change. It also ensures that all key information, data, assumptions, and knowledge are gathered to effectively inform decision-making while providing a platform for stakeholders to shape and influence policy proposals that will ultimately impact them, strengthening their agency.

The collaborative multi-stakeholder engagement component is transversal to several Working Packages of CLEVER and will contribute mainly to the construction and distilling of policy recommendations, as well as ensuring that research itself is relevant, legitimate, and fruitful. Consultations, interviews, and co-design will help shape CLEVER's theory of change, provide inquiries into actors' behaviour shifts as a response to governance mechanisms, and help understand the leverage points for biodiversity conservation that will be identified.

This document presents a description of how CLEVER engages stakeholders, the approach used, the role of co-design, and the different roles that stakeholder groups will have across the research agenda. Generally, stakeholder engagement activities respond to the chronogram of activities and deliverables from Working Package 2 to 8.

3. Approaches to Stakeholder Engagement: Co-design with Scope

3.1. Purpose and Objectives

Engaging the target groups that are most relevant to enact transformative change is a key strategy to ensure that CLEVER's research is relevant, applicable, and impactful. For that reason, a Stakeholder Reference Group (SRF) with representatives from policy, private sector, certifiers, and civil society initiatives was established at an early stage of the project. Interaction with the SRF members will contribute to refining the assumptions, hypotheses, and modelling scenarios to maximize relevance, credibility, and legitimacy.

Stakeholder engagement in CLEVER has three main objectives:

1. Enable the participation of a diverse non-academic group of representatives from relevant supply chains, as well as policymakers, certifying bodies, and civil society organisations for them to contribute to refining the scientific assumptions, hypotheses, and modelling scenarios of the project.
2. Facilitate knowledge transfer across partners via cloud sharing platforms and allow for stakeholders to become key informants for empirical research
3. Include and empower agents of change in the co-design process for innovative policy recommendations and governance instruments.

Later in the project, the SRF members and other potential agents of change will be involved in the process of distilling policy recommendations. These additional stakeholders will be invited based on identified sector representation gaps discussed in Chapter 4.

3.2. Stakeholder Reference Group: Desired Outcomes

WP Leaders introduced the CLEVER project to the SRF members, seeking to familiarize them with its objectives and scope. This allowed stakeholders to gain a better understanding of the issues at hand and facilitated fruitful discussions in subsequent engagements. The bilateral meetings were hosted by Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn (UBO), The European Forest Institute (EFI), Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (UFR), and The University of Dschang (UDs). UNEP-WCMC together with UBO developed an approach and guidance on how to prepare for bilateral meetings with SRF members. Following, the SRF consultations held between March and May 2023 provided valuable input for the co-design process. The interview material gathered during this period helped clarify the key research questions, resulting in the development of a Conceptual Framework. The objectives of these consultations have been the following:

1. Exchange of information about the project and the relevant working package

- Communicate why CLEVER is of relevance and importance to the stakeholder and start by obtaining an overview of their vision, role in the value chain, and needs.

2. Clarify expectations around the outcomes of the engagement.

- Manage expectations by communicating clearly and transparently about the outcomes the stakeholder can expect from their participation. The expectations from the CLEVER side are that the SRF representative will support the co-design process by: (i) providing updates on the value chain theories of change; (ii) spotting previously overlooked knowledge

gaps and potential leverage points; (iii) refining the assumptions and hypotheses in policy scenarios to maximize relevance, credibility, and legitimacy; and (iv) supporting the process of distilling policy recommendations.

3. Obtain and document feedback on specific research questions

- Document likely contributions for research design that emanate from the initial interviews.

The engagement builds upon the assumptions that:

- Private sector actors are interested in contributing to policy making, for example by expressing their concerns about the challenges of implementing the new deforestation regulation.
- Policymakers may want to hear views of the businesses and the third sector and inform them about future changes.
- Civil Society Organisations, each with their own set advocacy agenda, (i.e., environmental issues or social impacts) want to make their voice heard on decision-making platforms to ensure these are considered.

The Stakeholder Reference Group consists of 13 confirmed partners (in August 2023), as shown in Table 1. It includes representatives of Brazilian, Central African and EU level organisations from the private sector, policymakers, and civil society. Their scale and the geographical reach of their mandate is mixed as the group was the result of a convenience sampling considering availability. Table 2 shows the distribution of SRF representatives by sector and focus area.

Table 1 Organisations in the Stakeholder Reference Group

Organization	Role
Agrarpolitischer Dialog (ADP) Brazil	Policy Advisor (Germany-Brazil)
Association of the Oilseed Processing Industry in Germany (OVID)	Representative of EU Agro-Industry
Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) International	Certifier
EU Commission Directorate-General for the Environment	EU-Level Policy Maker
OTTO Group (Retailer)	German Retailer
Cameroon Ministère des Forêts et de la Faune (MINFOF)	African Policy Maker
Women Network for Sustainable Forest Management	Central African NGO
Cameroon United Forests (CUF)	African Forest Industry
Bundesanstalt für Landwirtschaft und Ernährung (BLE) Germany	German Policy Maker
Instituto de Manejo e Certificação Florestal e Agrícola (IMAFLORA)	Brazilian NGO
Association of Wood Export Industries of the State of Pará	Brazilian Forest Industry
Brazilian Association of Forest Concessionaires	Brazilian Forest Industry
Institute for Research in Tropical Ecology (IRET/CENAREST), Gabon	Forest Consulting Organization

Table 1 The Stakeholder Reference Group (SRF) coverage. The participation of the stakeholders groups marked with "X" has been confirmed. Grey cells indicate stakeholder groups that are not relevant for the geographical area (focus of production is on Brazil and Central Africa and focus of retail and consumption in Europe).

Sector	Brazil	Central Africa	EU/international
Production	X	X	
Processing			X
Trade & Distribution	X		
Retail & Consumption			X
Civil Society	X	X	
Certifying Bodies			X
Consulting Organization		X	
Polymakers	X	X	X

3.3. The Role of Co-design in CLEVER

The Stakeholder Reference Group will be the core instrument of the innovation landscape in CLEVER, and it will be occasionally complemented with the participation of other actors mapped previously in the stakeholder mapping stage of the project (Deliverable 8.1, *Mapping an Impact Network for Transformational Change in CLEVER*). Work Package 8 (WP8) aims to build upon the work with the SRF and engage a broader set of stakeholders not only to inform research, but also to enable uptake and to design solutions.

Transformative change requires dissemination of knowledge and evidence to policy makers, businesses, consumers, and the key groups across value chains. Therefore, WP8 works to ensure that targeted actors for CLEVER outputs are involved in the research co-design process. In this context, co-design aims to develop solutions together with the end-users and target groups. The purpose of co-design is to produce innovative and validated results that are relevant to the stakeholders and decision-makers who are able to act on CLEVER's recommendations for biodiversity conservation. To achieve this, co-design will primarily be implemented through a combination of scheduled hybrid and in-person interviews and workshops.

In order to maximize the impact and relevance of co-design, the efforts must be focused around the project areas that would benefit the most from it. The following potential areas of co-design have been identified:

Co-designing the theory of change and project work plan

Deliverable 4.2 (*Theories of Change and Influence Pathways*) will also be produced with the support of stakeholders via interviews and workshops. The theory of change along with the stakeholder maps will be openly available and constantly updated via CLEVER's website. Moreover, stakeholder inputs will shape the project work plan where appropriate.

Co-designing research through determining inputs to models

Modelling biodiversity impacts of different policy pathways also relies on core CLEVER outputs (such as D3.3 *Quantified ex-post impacts of trade in terrestrial biomass on biodiversity* and D7.2 *Quantified ex-ante global impacts from selected supply chains on biodiversity and other ecosystem services*) that will benefit from co-design. For this, the SRF and other selected stakeholders identified in the previous Impact Network Mapping, will help select and shape the policy scenarios simulated in the models.

Identifying leverage points that CLEVER can influence

For Deliverable 5.3 (*Actor-Specific Leverage Points for Transformative Change*), partners and researchers will work along the SRF, bringing in the lessons learnt from outputs 5.1 (*Behavioural Responses to Value Chain Related Policies and Governance Initiatives*) and 5.2 (*Qualitative Assessment of Leakage and Spillover*)

Potentials in Selected Value Chains) and participating in workshops to identify the core leverage points.

Co-designing solutions for these leverage points

The main target is the *Innovation Action Pool* development (Deliverable 8.6). As of one of its core outputs, CLEVER will consolidate knowledge and evidence into a compendium of proposals for policies and value chain governance arrangements that exploit new leverage points to reduce biodiversity impacts of trade. This will be done by working with all the outputs of the project, its researchers, and stakeholders, developing business cases and value propositions. Following, the involved stakeholders will work along with our partners to generate a system of *Criteria for Characterizing Individual Solutions* according to their impact and potential ability to address identified leverage points for biodiversity conservation.

As mentioned previously, the SRF is the core instrument of the co-innovation landscape, and the main vehicle for co-design. However, CLEVER partners will also conduct project content-related interviews with other key stakeholders. The nature of these additional engagements is consultation rather than co-design. For example, UFR and EFI have already conducted 10 interviews mainly with research organisations and certifying bodies as part of value chain mapping validation (Milestone 10, *Mapping of key value chains (actors)*). They are also planning to interview 90 value chain actors - for soy, timber, and wood pulp - in Central Africa, Brazil and in the EU. This work will be part of their empirical field research in *T5.1 Key value chain actors, behavioural drivers, and responses*. On the other hand, the Bonn.realis cluster (Bonn Research Alliance of innovative Information Systems in International Quality Food Chain and Crisis Communication) maintains a network of academic and private sector organisations in Bonn, Germany. This network can be reached as a sounding board for the project's research.

3.4. Engagement and Co-design Set Up

Stakeholder Mapping and Database

Building on the stakeholder mapping (D8.1) completed in February 2023, UNEP-WCMC and EFI further developed the stakeholder database and created an adjacent logbook to coordinate stakeholder interactions, record discussion highlights and maintain an effective platform to share information between partners throughout the project.

Research-Related Interviews and Coordination Meetings

Parallel to the engagement-focused Working Package 8, other CLEVER Working Packages conducted research-driven interviews to gather insights and perspectives for the relevant value chains and policy mapping. Coordination

meetings among CLEVER partners were held to understand each partner's focus areas, interview needs, and potential stakeholder engagement plans.

Development of the Conceptual Framework

To establish a joint understanding of key topics, the framework was developed through iterative processes. Memos from internal discussions, stakeholder interviews, and proposal revisions were reviewed to identify central themes. These themes were framed around CLEVER's specific research needs. The framework was then circulated among partners for comments, and a small workshop was conducted to add topics, delimitate questions, and prioritise key research areas. This allowed CLEVER partners to arrive to a joint understanding and conclusion of the key topics.

Utilization of the Conceptual Framework

The resulting framework serves as a basis for developing an interview question set that can be tailored to different organisations and interests. Furthermore, the modular questionnaire will be co-developed from September, encompassing general and specific questions depending on research needs. The framework can also be used as a communication tool when discussing key research questions with the SRF, allowing for feedback and further refinement. Ideas were explored to enhance communication and accessibility of the framework. It was suggested that the framework could be transformed into a mind map illustrating connections between thematic areas and partner responsibilities, serving as a valuable resource on the CLEVER website.

Limitations of the Methodology

Overall, the engagement approach has been multi-faceted, involving the SRF, content-related interviews, coordination meetings, and the development of a conceptual framework. These efforts ensure the integration of stakeholder perspectives and strengthen the legitimacy and relevance of research. While remote collaboration has proven useful to include geographically dispersed stakeholders, it is acknowledged that in-person workshops could have enhanced the quality, depth and reach of the stakeholder engagement process.

4. Insights from the Stakeholder Engagement Activities

4.1. Co-designing a Conceptual Framework

There are several purposes for the Conceptual Framework. Firstly, it helps form a common understanding of CLEVER's key research questions between the research partners. Secondly, it provides background to the key themes and facilitates communication about the research questions to stakeholders. The Framework is designed to help CLEVER partners prepare for stakeholder interviews but also for more spontaneous interaction. A detailed set of interview questions will be developed based on the Framework from September 2023 onwards.

The Framework was mainly elaborated using; (i) the CLEVER project proposal, (ii) discussions with the SRF members in spring 2023, (iii) a workshop and review rounds with the CLEVER partners to curate and short-list the priority topics.

Hence, the Framework is a product of co-design with both internal and external stakeholders. All four sections of the Framework are relevant for the discussions with stakeholders. However, not all the stakeholders will be interested in (or able to respond to) all sections. For that reason, when developing a more in-depth interview questionnaire, themes will be pre-selected and the set tailored on a stakeholder-specific basis. The Framework (Table 3) is intended to guide rather than limit discussion to specific questions.

Table 3: The CLEVER Conceptual Framework. The Framework consists of the four Project Needs of CLEVER (as stated in the project proposal). Under each project need there is a list of key thematic questions related to the topic, gathered from the project proposal, SRF discussions, and the CLEVER partners. The list of most relevant questions was curated based on the feedback provided by the CLEVER partners UBO, Bonn.realis, UFR, EFI and UPV in a workshop in June 23 and/or via email feedback.

<p>1. Quantitative information about the timing and location of impacts of global biomass trade on biodiversity and co-benefits</p>	<p>2. Understanding of indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, especially leakage and other spillover effects</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modelling work in CLEVER and related research questions is explained more in detail in a separate report <i>Deliverable 7.1: Co-designed modelling framework for supply chain governance initiatives</i>. The modelling focuses on the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What are the quantified biodiversity impacts of traded soy and forest products? ○ What can system level modelling reveal about direct and indirect impacts of trade of soy and forest products? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can policies in one region have knock-on effects on political processes in other regions? • How do changes in governance within one supply chain impact other supply chains (inter-chain spillover effects)? • What kind of intra and inter-regional spillover effects may result from trade-mediated shifts in sourcing patterns? • Who has the power in global supply chains?
<p>3. Knowledge about (non) effective practices for biodiversity conservation and co-benefits</p>	<p>4. Informed and transparent multi-actor negotiation processes to create ownership of knowledge about value chain governance solutions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the interplay of international / EU level initiatives, domestic public policies and voluntary / private mechanisms look like? • What is the effectiveness of trade certification, due diligence regulations, taxes, and subsidies? • What role do voluntary standards and certification schemes have to play under mandatory due diligence? • What are the transaction costs of value chain / biodiversity governance mechanisms and to who do they accrue? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can regulating consumption instead of trade be part of the solution? • What is the role and benefits of multi-actor negotiation processes? • How to generate a trust-building dialogue between stakeholders with conflicting interests?

4.2. Analysis of the Conceptual Framework

1. Quantitative information about the timing and location of impacts of global biomass trade on biodiversity and co-benefits

This relates to Project Objective I: *Improve our understanding of how biomass trade is linked to biodiversity outcomes and co-benefits in exporting and importing regions.*

Data-related questions are pivotal to the quantitative and modelling research work in CLEVER. Universidade Federal De Minas Gerais (UFMG), Universitat Politècnica De Valencia (UPV), Asociacion BC3 Basque Centre For Climate Change - Klima Aldaketa Ikergai (BC3), Internationales Institut Fuer Angewandte Systemanalyse (IIASA) and University of Bonn (UBO) are the main collaborators in this research area. More details and an overview of this collaboration can be found in the separate report: *Deliverable 7.1: Co-designed modelling framework for supply chain governance initiatives.*

Some research-related stakeholders (especially in target countries) may have information or access to data that is helpful to CLEVER. They may have information that could help interpret official data (for example, when they focus on the legality of production activities). Therefore, keeping the quantitative aspect in mind when planning stakeholder interaction is essential to inform research.

2. Understanding of indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, especially leakage and other spillover effects

This is linked to the Project Objective I: *Improve our understanding of how biomass trade is linked to biodiversity outcomes and co-benefits in exporting and importing region* and Objective II: *Provide empirical evidence for causal relationships between value chain governance initiatives and biodiversity outcomes.* CLEVER is yet to define the biodiversity outcomes and shared benefits to be discussed with stakeholders.

The key questions within this thematic area are related to leakage and spillover effects. Leakage can occur within a single value chain (e.g. Brazilian soy) or across different value chains and systems (e.g. food, feed, and biomass energy/value chains). Spillovers can occur within countries, regions or globally. It can be caused by changes in trade and supply management systems, such as changing requirements of certification schemes. One anticipated example of regulation-induced leakage could be if smaller companies start shifting their markets from Europe to other geographies due to higher compliance costs with the new EU Deforestation Regulation. Additionally, this topic raises questions related to power relations in global supply chains. Under this theme, the aim is to

better understand issues such as who has the power in negotiations and decision-making, or who are the vulnerable groups and why are they often excluded, despite increasing efforts to take vulnerable groups into account in trade policy. Co-designing policies together with stakeholders can help build solutions with less leakage and spillover effects.

3. Knowledge about (non) effective practices for biodiversity conservation and co-benefits

This is linked to the project Objective II: *Provide empirical evidence for causal relationships between value chain governance initiatives and biodiversity outcomes* and it is informing the Objective III: *Co-develop concepts and value propositions for innovative interventions that exploit leverage points enabled by improved value-chain transparency*. The questions focus on finding causal relationships between value chain governance and biodiversity outcomes and discovering effective practices. Work Packages 4 and 5, led by EFI and UFR, will delve into this topic in their case studies. They will be looking at causality between bioeconomy policies and biodiversity status and how value chain policies and governance mechanisms are translated into value chain actor behaviour. This question is also present in Work Package 7 led by IIASA.

The questions under this Project Need can support the work of EFI, UFR and IIASA but are also relevant broadly across the project. While the current focus of the deforestation conversation is heavily the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) adopted in May 2023, several existing policies that are already in force are also under consideration. Policies and mechanisms raised to the Framework include the EU Timber Regulation, FLEGT VPAs, domestic public policies (e.g. national forestry laws, Brazilian forest framework), taxes and subsidies, trade certifications, and voluntary standards and schemes.

There are several research questions related to the topic of certification and voluntary standards, such as their effectiveness, challenges related to supply chain traceability, and costs of implementation. These questions have been raised in early stakeholder engagement and will continue to be a topic for further discussion to help identify leverage points and solutions.

4. Informed and transparent multi-actor negotiation processes to create ownership of knowledge about value chain governance solutions.

This is linked to the Project Objective III: *Co-develop concepts and value propositions for innovative interventions that exploit leverage points enabled by improved value-chain transparency*.

Overall, this Objective is searching for promising governance solutions and enhancing multi-actor negotiation to implement them effectively. For example, by identifying governance solutions for leverage points, at both supply and

demand side. From the point of view of enhancing transparent multi-actor negotiation, processes to enable dialogue and trust between parties to support the effective implementation of solutions should be explored.

4.3. Additional Contributions

As a part of the stakeholder engagement approach, a gap analysis of organisations and agenda representation revealed that the participation of certain groups could be further encouraged and that these could be included in consultations or co-design activities. Therefore, to complement the work of the SRF, certain sectors and organisations are of special interest and their involvement will be encouraged. These are largely Civil Society Organisations and private sector representatives.

Civil Society Organisations already engaged as part of the SRF are IMAFLORA in Brazil and the Women Network for Sustainable Forest Management in Central Africa:

Additional CSOs to be engaged in the project could include groups such as:

- Focusing on IPLC agendas or representing local people:
 - i. Instituto Socioambiental (ISA) in Brazil
 - ii. Missionary Council for Indigenous Peoples (CIMI) in Brazil
 - iii. Green Development Advocates in Cameroon
 - iv. Community Association For Sustainable Development (CASuDEV) in Cameroon
- Working on women's rights in Brazil:
 - i. Movimento de Mulheres Camponesas in Brazil
 - ii. Mulheres do Agronegócio in Brazil
- Representing producers and workers:
 - i. Confederação Nacional dos Trabalhadores na Agricultura (National Confederation of Agricultural Worker)
 - ii. The Documentation Center of the Comissão Pastoral da Terra (Pastoral Commission of Land)

Other groups with gaps in the SRF can be found in private sector actors. These include commodity processors, traders, and distributors in all CLEVER locations. However, these will be included as part of the EFI and UFR interviews and workshops for Task 5.1 (*Behavioural Responses to Value Chain Related Policies and Governance Initiatives*).

Additionally, the UKRI GCRF Trade, Development & The Environment Hub (TRADE Hub) project, led by UNEP-WCMC, has built a network of stakeholders relevant to the trade of agricultural commodities, wildlife and wildmeat across several commodities and geographies that are relevant to CLEVER. TRADE Hub partners constitute over 50 organisations with experts in trade policy and economics, modelling, biodiversity, and social impact assessment. Stakeholders include those involved in international and regional trade policies, national policy makers, businesses with agricultural supply chains, finance institutions, research, and civil society organisations. Given the synergies between the two projects and the organisations involved, this network and the outputs from the TRADE Hub project can be a critical source of input to CLEVER research and co-design.

5. Conclusions

CLEVER recognizes the pivotal role of stakeholder engagement in achieving transformative change. To ensure relevance, credibility, and impact, the stakeholder engagement approach of CLEVER seeks to foster sustainable and collaborative efforts across various sectors, enabling them to contribute to policy proposals that will ultimately shape their own future. Transparent multi-actor participation processes play a crucial role in creating ownership of knowledge and successfully implementing governance solutions.

Central to CLEVER's approach is the establishment of a Stakeholder Reference Group (SRF), comprising representatives from policy settings, the private sector, certifiers, and civil society organisations that will provide a sounding board closer to the project. Early engagement with the SRF has informed the development of the Conceptual Framework presented in this report. The Framework will be used as a basis for further dialogue with a broader set of stakeholders, helping to structure interviews and enabling shaping research questions. Additionally, stakeholders act as key informants for empirical research, providing invaluable insights into real-world challenges and opportunities.

The objectives of stakeholder engagement are threefold. Firstly, it will enable diverse groups to contribute to refining assumptions and scenarios, ensuring research relevance. Secondly, it will facilitate knowledge transfer, enriching the research process with practical experience and expertise. Finally, through the co-design process, stakeholders will become instrumental in identifying leverage points and shaping innovative policy recommendations and governance instruments.

Engagement activities will be multi-faceted, encompassing bilateral meetings, research-driven interviews, workshops, and coordination meetings among partners. They will be synchronized with the project's calendar for outputs and milestones.

Recognizing that transformative change calls for co-designed solutions, CLEVER actively involves end-users and target groups through scheduled hybrid and in-person interviews and workshops. The SRF forms the core of this co-design process, supplemented by other selected actors previously identified during the stakeholder mapping stage. Co-design's main scope is to contribute to; (i) developing the Theory of Change of the project; (ii) shaping the simulated policy scenarios within the modelling of biodiversity impacts; (iii) the identification of Actor-Specific Leverage Points for Transformative Change and the qualitative assessments of behaviour changes; and (iv) the Innovation Action Pool development as well as the Criteria for Characterizing Individual Solutions.

In conclusion, CLEVER's stakeholder engagement and co-design approach holds significant promise for fostering participation for transformative change. This will be achieved by actively involving diverse stakeholders, promoting sustainable collaborations, and addressing shared challenges.