

Code tree and explanations

The following code tree gives an overview about the structure of the content analysis of the interview data. The numbers indicate the numbers of coded text passages per code.

1 Attitude towards nature conservation and BES credits*	
1.1 Benefit expectations nature conservation engagement in general*	
1.1.1 Reputation and brand value**	79
1.1.2 Lowering business risks**	25
1.1.3 Reduction of costs**	5
1.1.4 Increase of income**	1
1.1.5 Innovations**	0
1.1.6 New business models**	0
1.2 Benefit expectations BES credit purchase in particular	66
1.3 Risk expectations nature conservation engagement	42
1.4 Lack of benefits from BES credit purchase	77
1.5 Perception on who is responsible for nature conservation	
1.5.1 Self-responsibility, intrinsic motivation	76
1.5.2 Responsibility of others	8
2 Perceived pressure to act for nature conservation*	
2.1 Perceived stakeholder pressures are low	
2.1.1 No pressure	18
2.1.2 Managing directors/ owners	7
2.1.3 Employees	5
2.1.4 Customers	11
2.1.5 General public	3
2.1.6 Competitors	0
2.1.7 Legal requirements	4
2.2 Perceived stakeholder pressures are high	
2.2.1 Managing directors/ owners	30
2.2.2 Employees	9
2.2.3 Customers	2
2.2.4 General public	10
2.2.5 Competitors	6
2.2.6 Legal requirements	7
3 Perceived ability to act for nature conservation*	
3.1 Perceived project efficacy	
3.1.1 High efficacy	11
3.1.2 Low efficacy	12
3.2 Limited capacity to be engaged for nature conservation	
3.2.1 Limited time availability of employees to manage engagement	13
3.2.2 Limited decision-making power of interested employees	21
3.2.3 Limited budget to financially support nature conservation	19

3.2.4 Other barriers for companies to be engaged	7
4 Stated online-marketplace preferences	
4.1 Preferred functionalities and services of the online-marketplace	59
4.2 Preferred communication and design of the online-marketplace	19
4.3 Importance to be in direct contact with BES credit provider	22
4.4 Stated preferences regarding payment modalities	
4.4.1 Company is ok or even prefers co-financing of projects	24
4.4.2 Company prefers to finance a project alone, no co-financing	6
4.4.3 Preferences regarding donation receipts	17
5 Stated BES credits preferences	
5.1 Stated preferences on the type of quantified BES	
5.1.1 Biodiversity	16
5.1.2 ES that relate to climate	14
5.1.3 ES that relate to water	9
5.1.4 ES that relate to soils	6
5.1.5 ES that relate to air quality	2
5.1.6 ES that relate to cultural aspects	4
5.1.7 No specific BES preferences	5
5.2 Stated preferences on the landscape context	
5.2.1 agricultural land	9
5.2.2 forest	3
5.2.3 rural landscape in general	3
5.2.4 urban	5
5.2.5 No preferences	5
5.3 Stated regional preferences	
5.3.1 Reasons for regional projects	49
5.3.2 Near to HQ	22
5.3.3 near to value chain	16
5.3.4 near to customers	12
5.4 Preferences regarding projects from which BES credits originate	47
5.5 Preferences regarding communication and design of BES credits	31
5.6 Preferences regarding quantification and certification of BES	11
6 Stated intentions to buy BES credits through online-marketplace*	
6.1 Potential interest in buying BES credits	20
6.2 Stated sum	23
6.3 No interest in buying BES credits	13
6.4 Undecided whether the purchase of BES credits may be of interest	7
6.5 Stated interest in the possibility to provide BES credits	6

* **Deductive codes**, based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour, developed by Ajzen (Ajzen)

** **Deductive codes**, based on the business case drivers, developed by The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) (Schaltegger et al., 2016)

The codes without a star are **inductive codes**, i.e. were derived from the interview material.

1 Attitude towards nature conservation and BES credits*

Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen 1991): To which degree is an action/ behaviour favourable or unfavourable? “Attitude” it is the sum of expected outcomes of a behaviour combined with the desirability of those outcomes (outcome beliefs).

1.1 Benefit expectations nature conservation engagement in general*

This code includes benefit expectations (motives) as to why companies are voluntarily engaged in nature conservation. This code focuses on the business-relevant motives, i.e. the *business case drivers* that positively affect business success. If the respondent speaks of altruistic reasons, which do not contribute to the business success, the information rather belongs to the category of "Perceived pressure to act for nature conservation" (social norms).

1.1.1 Reputation and brand value**

A TEEB business case driver (Schaltegger et al., 2016), examples: brand management and credibility, strengthening of ties with stakeholders, creation of a corporate identity, etc.

1.1.2 Lowering business risks**

A TEEB business case driver (Schaltegger et al., 2016), examples: security in legislative and planning issues, proactive management of the internal and external business environment, reduction of stakeholder interests that conflict with business interests, security in the long-term raw material supply, security in access to capital, etc.

1.1.3 Reduction of costs**

A TEEB business case driver (Schaltegger et al., 2016), examples: extensification of property management, reduction of energy and resource consumption, reduction of emissions, waste and land sealing subject to charge, etc.

1.1.4 Increase of income**

A TEEB business case driver (Schaltegger et al., 2016), examples: customers pay higher prices for ecological products or prefer a product over the one of a competitor, development of new customer markets, etc.

1.1.5 Innovations**

A TEEB business case driver (Schaltegger et al., 2016): implementation of new technical and/ or organisational ideas, products or processes with sufficient potential for sale and differentiation from competitors, such as bionic.

1.1.6 New business models**

A TEEB business case driver (Schaltegger et al., 2016): companies whose business activity is based on nature conservation, which secures the economic existence of a company (exceeds innovations).

1.2 Benefit expectations BES credit purchase in particular

This code includes statements of respondents about the corporate benefit expectations from a voluntary investment in BES credits in particular. Which benefits would companies hope/ expect to get when buying BES credits as compared to more “traditional” ways of engagement, i.e. implementing own conservation projects or donating to an environmental organisations?

1.3 Risk expectations nature conservation engagement

This code includes risk expectations of companies that might arise from a voluntary engagement for nature conservation in general as well as BES credits in particular, e.g. greenwashing accusations from the general public, risk of company credibility, etc.

1.4 Lack of benefits from BES credit purchase

This code includes information why companies are generally not interested in nature conservation reasons as well as why respondents do not see a use/ benefit from the purchase of BES credits in particular.

1.5 Perception on who is responsible for nature conservation

This code includes information to what extent the respondent perceives either the company itself (self-responsibility) or others to be responsible to address the challenges of environmental degradation and therefore feels obliged (or not) to act voluntarily for nature conservation.

1.5.1 Self-responsibility, intrinsic motivation

This code includes information on the intrinsic motivation that drives a company's engagement for nature conservation, e.g. interviewee statements showing a belief that own contribution matters, altruism, personal satisfaction from acting responsibly, contributing to welfare, personal interest in nature, etc.

1.5.2 Responsibility of others

Interviewee statements that show that others (e.g. the government) are thought to be responsible for paying for nature conservation, i.e. reasons why the respondent does not think to be responsible for paying for nature conservation voluntarily.

2 Perceived pressure to act for nature conservation*

Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen 1991): subjective (socially) expected mode of conduct and social pressure to behave a certain way; normative beliefs about what others think should be done.

2.1 Perceived internal/ external stakeholder pressures are low

Code contains information regarding the lack of perceived pressures (social desirability) from different stakeholder groups to act voluntarily for nature conservation, i.e. due to the lack of external pressures the company does not need to be voluntarily engaged in nature conservation in order to fulfil expectations.

2.1.1 No pressure

Statements of companies that show that they do not feel pressure from stakeholder groups that drive their engagement for nature conservation.

2.1.2 Managing directors/ owners

Statements that there is little or no pressure/ support from managing directors/ owners to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.1.3 Employees

Statements that employees do not expect their company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.1.4 Customers

Statements that customers do not expect the company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.1.5 General public

Statements that the general public does not expect the company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.1.6 Competitors

Statements that the company does not feel pressure to be engaged for nature conservation due to engagement or requirements of competitors.

2.1.7 Legal requirements

Statements that legal requirements do not exert pressure on the company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.2 Perceived internal/ external stakeholder pressures are high

Code contains information regarding perceived pressures (social desirability) from different stakeholder groups to act voluntarily for nature conservation, i.e. due to external pressures the company feels the need to be voluntarily engaged in nature conservation in order to fulfil expectations.

2.2.1 Managing directors/ owners

Statements that there is high pressure/ support from managing directors/ owners to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.2.2 Employees

Statements that employees expect their company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.2.3 Customers

Statements that customers expect the company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.2.4 General public

Statements that the general public expects the company to be engaged for nature conservation.

2.2.5 Competitors

Statements that the company feels pressure to be engaged for nature conservation due to engagement or requirements of competitors.

2.2.6 Legal requirements

Statements that legal requirements exert pressure on the company to be engaged for nature conservation.

3 Perceived ability to act for nature conservation*

Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen 1991): perception of the ease or difficulty to behave a certain way; available resources and opportunities to behave a certain way; prediction of achievement following a certain behavior, i.e. the efficacy or "chances of success" following a certain behaviour; factors that hinder or support the transformation of stated behaviour (intention) into real action.

3.1 Perceived project efficacy

In how far do respondents perceive that their contribution to nature conservation matters/ is effective? In how far do the respondents think that the support of BES projects can really make a positive contribution to nature conservation goals?

3.1.1 High efficacy

Statements that show a perception of high project and self-efficacy.

3.1.2 Low efficacy

Statements that show a perception of low project and self-efficacy.

3.2 Limited capacity to be engaged for nature conservation

Information on barriers to the perceived ability of interviewees to be voluntarily engaged for nature conservation by "traditional" means, i.e. organising own projects as well as donating to and partnering with environmental organisations. What might be barriers to the perceived ability to do so? Which barriers to "traditional" company engagement forms are in return promoting factors for companies to use an online-marketplace for biodiversity and ecosystem services?

3.2.1 Limited time availability of employees to manage engagement

This code includes statements on limited time availability of employees as to why companies are not voluntarily engaged.

3.2.2 Limited decision-making power of interested employees

This code includes statements on limited decision-making power of interested employees as to why companies are not voluntarily engaged.

3.2.3 Limited budget to financially support nature conservation

This code includes statements on limited budgets as to why companies are not voluntarily engaged.

3.2.4 Other barriers for companies to be engaged

This code includes statements on other barriers as to why companies are not voluntarily engaged.

4 Stated online-marketplace preferences

The online-marketplace exists to facilitate the investment of companies in biodiversity and ES (intermediary role). Therefore, the online-marketplace should be designed in a way to increase the perceived ability of companies to invest in BES credits. Thus, this code includes responses of interviewees regarding the preferred features and design of the online-marketplace: How would companies like to buy BES credits? Which preferences do companies have regarding the online-marketplace itself?

4.1 Preferred functionalities and services of the online-marketplace

Which functionalities and services do companies want to have from the online-marketplace? Which recommendations do company representatives give regarding the functions of the website?

4.2 Preferred communication and design of the online-marketplace

How would interviewees like the online-marketplace to look like? What would be important to them?

4.3 Importance to be in direct contact with BES credit provider

In how far is it important to companies that they can be in direct contact with the BES credit provider (e.g. farmer or a responsible landscape care organisation)? Is the direct contact important or are companies willing to buy BES credits from an anonymous pool of BES credit providers?

4.4 Stated preferences regarding payment modalities

Which payment preferences do companies have?

4.4.1 Company is ok or even prefers co-financing of projects

Company is ok or even prefers co-financing of projects with others (crowdfunding), includes both, with other companies and other private individuals.

4.4.2 Company prefers to finance a project alone, no co-financing

Statements that companies prefer to finance a project alone, no co-financing.

4.4.3 Preferences regarding donation receipts

In how far is it important that companies would receive a donating receipt for their purchase of BES credits?

5 Stated BES credits preferences

Information about the kind of BES credits that companies would potentially be interested in buying through an online-marketplace, e.g. regarding the type of quantified biodiversity and ecosystem services as well as landscape and regional aspects that influence whether or not they are interested in buying certain BES credits or not.

5.1 Stated preferences on the type of quantified BES

In which type of biodiversity and ecosystem services would companies like to invest, e.g. biodiversity, water, climate, soil related ES?

5.1.1 Biodiversity

Statements that companies would like to buy BES credits targeted to protect certain species, genes or the diversity of rather natural ecosystems.

5.1.2 ES that relate to climate

Statements that companies would like to buy BES credits targeted to reduce CO2 emissions, to stabilise local and global climate, etc.

5.1.3 ES that relate to water

Statements that companies would like to buy BES credits targeted to protect water bodies in their quality and quantity, e.g. reduction of nitrogen input, filtration of clean water, etc.

5.1.4 ES that relate to soils

Statements that companies would like to buy BES credits targeted to secure healthy and fertile soils, e.g. protection from over-fertilisation.

5.1.5 ES that relate to air quality

Statements that companies would like to buy BES credits targeted to secure clean air, e.g. reduction of pollutants in the air.

5.1.6 ES that relate to cultural aspects

Statements that companies would like to buy BES credits targeted to protect cultural ES, e.g. landscapes

aesthetics and traditional heritage.

5.1.7 No specific BES preferences

Statements that companies do not have a certain topic they would like to invest in.

5.2 Stated preferences on the landscape context

In which landscapes would companies like to protect biodiversity and ES, i.e. in which spatial contexts should nature conservation projects be located in order to match the companies interest?

5.2.1 Agricultural land

Statements of companies to buy BES credits from conservation projects in agricultural lands – positive as well as negative aspects.

5.2.2 Forest

Statements of companies to buy BES credits from conservation projects in forests – positive as well as negative aspects.

5.2.3 Rural landscape in general

Statements of companies to buy BES credits from conservation projects in rural landscapes in general – positive as well as negative aspects.

5.2.4 Urban

Statements of companies to buy BES credits from conservation projects in cities – positive as well as negative aspects.

5.2.5 No preferences

Statements that companies do not have a landscape preference, where they would like to invest in.

5.3 Stated regional preferences

Where would companies like to invest, i.e. which regional preferences do companies have?

5.3.1 Reasons for regional projects

What are the reasons why regional nature conservation engagement is important for companies?

5.3.2 Near to HQ

Statements that show, companies would like to invest in nature conservation projects that are near their company locations.

5.3.3 Near to value chain

Statements that show, companies would like to invest in nature conservation projects that are near their value chain, i.e. the regions from where they source their materials.

5.3.4 Near to customers

Statements that show, companies would like to invest in nature conservation projects that are near to their customers, i.e. their market regions.

5.4 Preferences regarding projects from which BES credits originate

In how far is it important to the companies from which conservation projects their BES credits originate? Which preferences do companies have regarding the projects?

5.5 Preferences regarding communication and design of BES credits

Statements that give information on the requirements of companies regarding the communication and design of BES credits.

5.6 Preferences regarding quantification and certification of BES

Statements that give information on the requirements of companies regarding quantification and certification of BES credits.

6 Stated intentions to buy BES credits through online-marketplace*

Based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen 1991): the stated intention to behave a certain way is a function of attitude, perceived pressures and perceived ability to behave a certain way, i.e. buy BES credits through an online-marketplace. In how far stated the companies a potential interest in buying BES credits?

6.1 Potential interest in buying BES credits

Statements of companies that show they would be potentially interested in buying BES credits through an online-marketplace.

6.2 Stated sum

Information on how much would companies pay for BES credits. But also: For how much do companies usually support nature conservation projects, e.g. donations to environmental organisations or costs to implement own projects?

6.3 No interest in buying BES credits

Statements of companies that show they would not be interested in buying BES credits through an online-marketplace.

6.4 Undecided whether the purchase of BES credits may be of interest

Statements of companies that show they are uncertain whether or not the purchase of BES credits through an online-marketplace would be of interest.

6.5 Stated interest in the possibility to provide BES credits

Companies that stated a potential interest not in buying BES credits but instead offering BES credits as a company. The BES credits would stem from projects that the companies do within their own nature conservation engagement.

References

- AJZEN, I. 1991. The Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Organizational Behavior and Human decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- SCHALTEGGER, S., BESTÄNDIG, U. & WUCZKOWSKI, M. 2016. Berücksichtigung von Ökosystemleistungen in Privatwirtschaftlichen Entscheidungen. In: ALBERT, C. V. H. C. (ed.) *Ökosystemleistungen in ländlichen Räumen – Grundlage für menschliches Wohlergehen und nachhaltige wirtschaftliche Entwicklung*. Hannover; Leipzig: Naturkapital Deutschland.