

Tool 1: Coproduction in the Public Lands Context

An informational tool provided as part of a toolkit for researchers and resource managers with an interest in coproducing actionable science to support public land management.

The federal government is committed to using science to inform decision making.¹ Federal staff need usable science products to inform management decisions and actions across multiuse landscapes. A coproduction approach to conducting science is one mechanism that can help ensure that science requested by federal resource managers meets their needs. Coproduction empowers researchers and resource managers to produce knowledge and tools that are relevant, timely, and more easily integrated into agency work processes.^{2,3}

Staff in the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Geological Survey, North Central Climate Adaptation Science Center, U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service worked together to develop this informational toolkit. The toolkit is intended to support coproduction of science products that can inform decision making on federally managed public lands.

As part of the process of developing this toolkit, we talked to staff in multiple federal agencies and found that there was not a common understanding of what the term coproduction means. This finding led our team to create this tool.

Coproduction

Coproduction is an approach to producing actionable science through collaboration between researchers, scientists, specialists, planners, managers, and related stakeholders to inform policy and management decisions.⁴⁻⁶

Actionable science

Actionable science includes data, analyses, syntheses, projections, and tools that can support resource management decisions.⁴

Coproduction is a process that both requires and fosters development of strong working relationships. The level of collaboration can vary widely depending on the nature of individual projects (see "[Tool 2: What Level of Coproduction Makes Sense for My Project?](#)"). Coproduction can include stakeholders such as private landowners, Native American tribes, and many others. However, the focus of this toolkit is on coproduction between federal public land management agencies and science providers.

Shared understanding, expertise, and roles

Partners engage in coproduction with respect, trust, and a desire to learn from and work closely with each other. They also continually strive to better understand each other's professional context, constraints, and opportunities. Many agency researchers have policy and resource management experience, and many resource managers, planners, and decision makers are often also scientists. This overlap in expertise and willingness to learn and engage with others can facilitate successful research-management collaborations.

Engaging in coproduction means that staff from both the resource management agency and the science agency or organization work together as partners on many, if not all, major aspects of projects, from conception to application (see figure).^{6,7} Individual staff roles and responsibilities will vary depending on the nature of the project.




Figure: Aspects of coproduction in the public lands context.

Potential benefits of coproduction

- Science that is actionable (relevant, timely, and useful for decision making).^{7,8,9,10}
- Science products that are more likely to be trusted, easy to integrate into agency work processes, and accessible (e.g., in formats beyond traditional scientific publications).^{2,7,11}
- Meaningful and relevant development of professional skillsets for partners.^{7,11}
- Science support for use of products in agency work processes.¹¹
- Ongoing opportunities for networking that can support long-term programmatic and partnership growth.^{3,7,9,11}
- Resource management that is more responsive to environmental changes and stakeholder needs.^{3,6}
- Ability to better focus research investments on the science topics and deliverables that managers need.^{4,10,11}

Potential challenges of coproduction

- As a relatively new approach to conducting science, there are few standard tools or institutional structures that can facilitate and support coproduction.^{2,11}
- Extra time may be needed from researchers and resource managers to identify partners and participants, develop and conduct the project, maintain good communication, and develop actionable products.^{7,9-11}
- Skills and staff specialized in information exchange and facilitation may be needed.^{7,10,11}
- Divergent individual motivations and career evaluation metrics may not support coproduction.^{7,9,11}
- Institutional structure, culture, and policies can complicate partnership interactions.^{7,11}

Suggested Citation

Selby, L.B., Carter, S.K., Haby, T.S., Wood, D.J.A., Bamzai-Dodson, A., Anderson, P.J., Herrick, J.E., Samuel, E.M., and Tull, J.C. Coproduction in the Public Lands Context: An informational tool provided as part of a toolkit for researchers and resource managers with an interest in coproducing actionable science to support public land management. Denver (CO): U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management; 2024. <https://www.blm.gov/noc/report/toolkit-coproducing-actionable-science-support-public-land-management>.

Tool 1 References

1. Memorandum on Restoring Trust in Government Through Scientific Integrity and Evidence-Based Policymaking. The White House. 2021 Jan 27 [accessed 2023 Apr 03]. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/27/memorandum-on-restoring-trust-in-government-through-scientific-integrity-and-evidence-based-policymaking/>.
2. Kruk, M.C., Parker, B., Marra, J.J., Werner, K., Heim, R., Vose, R., and Malsale, P. Engaging with users of climate information and the coproduction of knowledge. *Weather, Climate, and Society*. 2017; 9(4):839–849. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1175/WCAS-D-16-0127.1>.
3. Laursen, S., Puniwai, N., Genz, A.S., Nash, S.A.B., Canale, L.K., and Ziegler-Chong, S. Collaboration across worldviews: Managers and scientists on Hawai'i island utilize knowledge coproduction to facilitate climate change adaptation. *Environmental Management*. 2018; 62:619–630. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-018-1069-7>.
4. Beier, P., Hansen, L.J., Helbrecht, L., and Behar, D. A how-to guide for coproduction of actionable science. *Conservation Letters*. 2016; 10(3):288–296. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12300>.
5. Bamzai-Dodson, A., Cravens, A.E., Wade, A.A, and McPherson, R.A. Engaging with stakeholders to produce actionable science: A framework and guidance. *Weather, Climate, and Society*. 2021; 13(4):1027-1041. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1175/wcas-d-21-0046.1>.
6. Meadow, A.M., Ferguson, D.B., Guido, Z., Horangic, A., Owen, G., and Wall, T. Moving toward the deliberate coproduction of climate science knowledge. *Weather, Climate, and Society*. 2015; 7(2):179–191. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1175/wcas-d-14-00050.1>.
7. Dilling, L., and Lemos, M.C. Creating usable science: Opportunities and constraints for climate knowledge use and their implications for science policy. *Global Environmental Change*. 2011; 21(2):680–689. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.11.006>.
8. Cash, D.W., Clark, W.C., Alcock, F., Dickson, N.M., Eckley, N., Guston, D.H., Jäger, J., and Mitchell, R.B. Knowledge systems for sustainable development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2003; 100(14):8086–8091. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1231332100>.
9. Pearman, O., and Cravens, A.E. Institutional barriers to actionable science: Perspectives from decision support tool creators. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 2022; 128:317–325. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.12.004>.
10. Naugle, D.E., Allred, B.W., Jones, M.O., Twidwell, D., and Maestas, J.D. Coproducing science to inform working lands: The next frontier in nature conservation. *BioScience*. 2020; 70(1):90–96. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biz144>.
11. Cvitanovic, C., Howden, M., Colvin, R.M., Norström, A., Meadow, A.M., and Addison, P.F.E. Maximising the benefits of participatory climate adaptation research by understanding and managing the associated challenges and risks. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 2019; 94:20–31. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.12.028>.