

Review of: "Ecosystem Services Inequality Driven by Agroextractivism in Salamina, Colombia: A Critical Institutional Analysis"

Tomaso Ceccarelli¹

¹ Wageningen University & Research

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I believe that the paper is well-written and interesting in the effort to combine the two frameworks proposed and in general to use access to ecosystem services as a lens to evaluate social inequality. This framework, in addition to the interpretative value of the case study, can prove to be usefully applied to similar past and present agricultural transformations in many geographies.

I have some difficulty when the author aims to translate this analysis into equalizing mechanisms and rules (Table 3), which should ultimately influence governance, regulations, and concrete interventions aiming at readdressing asymmetries in the access to ES benefits.

I wonder whether equality, understood as access to the same resources or opportunities, should not be considered critically as the ultimate objective, which I guess could be referred to as social justice (awaiting a sharper definition as suggested by one of the reviews), for the different actors in the avocado value chain in Salamina in the Department of Caldas, Colombia, namely corporate growers and rural peasants.

To be more clear, can we realistically expect that all actors will have the “freedom to occupy the best position in the landscape,” as stated in the positioning rule (what about legacies due to land tenure, economic access to land)? And what does “having a fair option of being part of the agricultural landscape” concretely mean? I find the other equalising rules more convincing, e.g., the fairness in the control of governance, openness of ES information, and ultimately a balanced distribution of costs and benefits. The concept of equity seems therefore more appropriate as it recognizes that actors have different starting points and may require different levels and types of support to achieve similar outcomes (social justice).

I am aware of the ample literature (e.g., Laterra et al., 2018) on linking inequalities and ecosystem services, but I wonder if this might not be an opportunity to at least provide a little clarity.

It is also useful for making these balancing rules and activating mechanisms even more concrete: although we can agree that this is not necessarily the prerogative of research, I believe that the paper would greatly benefit from making them more specific, and I am sure that the author has all the knowledge to do so.

Otherwise, I agree with the reviews that indicate the structure should be restructured following a classical division

between definition of the research questions, theoretical references, methods and data, results, conclusions, and that some concepts are repeated multiple times. Also, that the relationship between institutions, governance systems, and ES can be explored further, and I would think precisely by adopting this particular lens based on equity.