

Instructions for submitting an abstract

You are invited to submit an abstract before December 15th. **Acknowledgment of receipt will be sent automatically. If you do not receive any acknowledgment, please contact us again.**

For talks, a maximum of two abstracts will be accepted for each speaker. All authors of accepted abstracts must register and be paid in full by the early registration deadline (currently February 2018). Authors failing to comply with this rule will not be included in the Conference Programme.

Oral (spoken) presentations will be limited to 20 minutes: 15 minutes for presentation and 5 minutes for questions. Contributed oral presentations will be grouped by topic. If your abstract is accepted but cannot be accommodated as an oral presentation, we may offer you the opportunity to present a poster. All oral presentation rooms will be equipped with a computer and a data projector. Poster presenters will receive general instructions on poster format once the abstract is accepted. Detailed information and instructions on presentations at the meeting will be available to presenters several months before the meeting.

Proposals must contain the following information:

| | |
|--|---|
| Talk or poster presentation? | Talk |
| Language of the presentation | English |
| Title of the presentation (limited to 150 characters including spaces) | Evidence synthesis in the antipodes: bringing together non-standard sources of evidence to inform environmental flows management in Australia |
| Author's name | Angus Webb |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • affiliation | University of Melbourne, Australia |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complete contact information | Department of Infrastructure Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e-mail address | angus.webb@unimelb.edu.au |
| Abstract (limited to 150 words) | CEE systematic reviews are recognized within the evidence synthesis community as being the gold standard for informing decisions. However, what happens when this standard of evidence synthesis is not possible? Many Australian management agencies still believe that informally seeking the opinions of one or more experts constitutes 'evidence-based practice'. Moreover, some questions do not have the evidence base to allow systematic review. We report on a process developed to assess the capacity of 'complementary measures' (e.g. habitat restoration) to improve the benefits from environmental water delivered under Australia's Murray-Darling Basin Plan. We use formal expert elicitation to quantify ecological responses within Bayesian Network models. This reduces the effects of expert overconfidence and bias that afflict informally obtained expert knowledge. Rapid Evidence Assessment is used as an additional line of evidence to support the models. Although not the gold standard, the method provides a way forward for investment in complementary measures. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Required support for French/English translation (for talks) | Support required for any French translation |
|---|---|